

Sufficiency of Rényi divergences

Niklas Galke^{1*}, Lauritz van Luijk^{2†}, Henrik Wilming^{2‡}

¹Física Teòrica: Informació i Fenòmens Quàntics, Departament de Física,
Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, 08193 Bellaterra, Spain

²Leibniz Universität Hannover, Appelstraße 2, 30167 Hannover, Germany

June 1, 2023

Abstract

A set of classical or quantum states is equivalent to another one if there exists a pair of classical or quantum channels mapping either set to the other one. For dichotomies (pairs of states) this is closely connected to (classical or quantum) Rényi divergences (RD) and the data-processing inequality: If a RD remains unchanged when a channel is applied to the dichotomy, then there is a recovery channel mapping the image back to the initial dichotomy. Here, we prove for classical dichotomies that equality of the RDs alone is already sufficient for the existence of a channel in any of the two directions and discuss some applications. We conjecture that equality of the minimal quantum RDs is sufficient in the quantum case and prove it for special cases. We also show that neither the Petz quantum nor the maximal quantum RDs are sufficient. As a side-result of our techniques we obtain an infinite list of inequalities fulfilled by the classical, the Petz quantum, and the maximal quantum RDs. These inequalities are not true for the minimal quantum RDs.

Contents

1	Introduction	2
2	Structure of interconvertible states	5
3	Dichotomies: Sufficient families of Rényi divergences	8
3.1	Solution for the classical case	10
3.2	Quantum case: Conjecture	13
3.3	Complete monotonicity	17
3.4	Quantum f -divergences	19
A	Interconvertibility from Renyi Divergences without absolute continuity	22
B	Convertibility and interconvertibility for probability vectors	24
C	Proof of Theorem 4 for infinite-dimensional systems	27

*niklas.galke@uab.cat

†lauritz.vanluijk@itp.uni-hannover.de

‡henrik.wilming@itp.uni-hannover.de

1 Introduction

A statistical experiment is generally described by an indexed set of probability measures or quantum states $\{\rho_\theta\}_{\theta \in \Theta}$ (we use the notation for density matrices throughout this introduction and use the word state in both cases). The parameter θ can be discrete or continuous and may be thought of as a parameter that controls the experiment and is sought to be estimated. For example, in the special case of *binary* experiments with $\Theta = \{0, 1\}$ it may be thought of as labelling two hypotheses to be distinguished. One experiment $\{\rho_\theta^{(1)}\}_{\theta \in \Theta}$ can be considered as at least as informative as another one $\{\rho_\theta^{(2)}\}_{\theta \in \Theta}$ if there exists a (classical or quantum) channel T so that $T(\rho_\theta^{(1)}) = \rho_\theta^{(2)}$. In this case we write $\{\rho_\theta^{(1)}\}_{\theta \in \Theta} \rightarrow \{\rho_\theta^{(2)}\}_{\theta \in \Theta}$. The channel T may be viewed as a randomization or coarse-graining operation. It is a classic problem in statistics to provide necessary and sufficient conditions that characterize when one experiment is more informative than another one [1].

In this paper we consider a much simpler problem: When is it the case that two experiments are *equivalent*, meaning that either experiment is at least as informative as the other? In other words, we ask when there exist (classical or quantum) channels that T and R such that

$$T(\rho_\theta^{(1)}) = \rho_\theta^{(2)}, \quad R(\rho_\theta^{(2)}) = \rho_\theta^{(1)} \quad \forall \theta \in \Theta. \quad (1)$$

If this is the case we will also say that the two sets are *interconvertible* and write

$$\{\rho_\theta^{(1)}\}_{\theta \in \Theta} \longleftrightarrow \{\rho_\theta^{(2)}\}_{\theta \in \Theta}. \quad (2)$$

In the language of statistics, interconvertible sets of states describe experiments that are *sufficient* with respect to each other [1–5].

We first consider the case of density matrices $\rho_\theta^{(j)}$ (finite or infinite-dimensional) and discuss the minimal normal form for two interconvertible sets of density matrices and the associated quantum channels T, R . The normal form is based on the Koashi-Imoto theorem [6] and its infinite-dimensional generalizations [4, 7]. As a corollary it shows that non-commuting sets of density matrices cannot be interconverted with commuting sets of density matrices, a result closely connected to the “no-teleportation theorem”. As a side-result we also find that the set of fixed points of any entanglement-breaking channel is commutative.

Having established the normal form for interconvertible density matrices, we then specialize to the case of binary experiments. This case simply corresponds to pairs of states also known as *dichotomies* (ρ, σ) . We also say that a dichotomy (ρ_1, σ_1) is *convertible to* or that it (*quantum*) *relatively majorizes* (ρ_2, σ_2) if $(\rho_1, \sigma_1) \rightarrow (\rho_2, \sigma_2)$ [8–18]. (To ease notation, we index different dichotomies by subscripts instead of superscripts.) The study of dichotomies and their convertability is closely related to the study of *divergences* of states, which are functions on dichotomies that characterize how distinguishable the two states are. The central properties of a general divergence \mathbb{D} are:

1. Positivity: $\mathbb{D}(\rho, \sigma) \geq 0$ with equality if and only if $\rho = \sigma$,
2. Data-processing: $\mathbb{D}(T(\rho), T(\sigma)) \leq \mathbb{D}(\rho, \sigma)$.

Many divergences, in particular the Rényi divergences we will see later, also satisfy the additional property of being additive over tensor-products:

$$\mathbb{D}(\rho_1 \otimes \rho_2, \sigma_1 \otimes \sigma_2) = \mathbb{D}(\rho_1, \sigma_1) + \mathbb{D}(\rho_2, \sigma_2). \quad (3)$$

The prototypical example of an additive divergence is the quantum relative entropy

$$D(\rho, \sigma) = \text{tr}[\rho(\log(\rho) - \log(\sigma))], \quad (4)$$

with $D(\rho, \sigma) = \infty$ if the support of ρ is not contained in that of σ . However, divergences come in many flavors and we will see a variety below. One way to give operational meaning to them is in asymptotic settings, where one asks for the maximum rate $R = m/n$ to convert $(\rho_1, \sigma_1)^{\otimes n}$ into $(\rho_2, \sigma_2)^{\otimes m}$ (possibly up to a small error). It follows immediately from these properties that if $(\rho_1, \sigma_1)^{\otimes n}$ can be converted into $(\rho_2, \sigma_2)^{\otimes n}$, then $R \leq \mathbb{D}(\rho_1, \sigma_1)/\mathbb{D}(\rho_2, \sigma_2)$ for any valid additive divergence. In fact asymptotic conversion rates can often be expressed exactly as ratios of suitable divergences of the dichotomies [17–21].

Here, we study the role of divergences for the interconvertibility of dichotomies without taking an asymptotic limit. It is clear from the data-processing inequality that any valid divergence must be invariant among interconvertible dichotomies:

$$(\rho_1, \sigma_1) \longleftrightarrow (\rho_2, \sigma_2) \Rightarrow \mathbb{D}(\rho_1, \sigma_1) = \mathbb{D}(\rho_2, \sigma_2). \quad (5)$$

Moreover, it was shown in [2–4] that if $(\rho_1, \sigma_1) \rightarrow (\rho_2, \sigma_2)$ and it is true that $D(\rho_1, \sigma_1) = D(\rho_2, \sigma_2)$, then the two dichotomies are automatically also interconvertible. The same statement holds true for classical probability measures when D is replaced by the Kullback-Leibler (KL) divergence [22]. It also holds when the relative entropy (or KL divergence) is replaced by a suitable *f-divergence* (which we discuss below) [23].

But what happens if we do not know whether one of two divergences is convertible to the other one? Could it be true that equality of a family of divergences alone already implies that two dichotomies are interconvertible? Let $\{\mathbb{D}_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$ be a family of divergences labelled by a parameter λ . We define such a family to be *sufficient* if

$$\mathbb{D}_\lambda(\rho_1, \sigma_1) = \mathbb{D}_\lambda(\rho_2, \sigma_2) \quad \forall \lambda \in \Lambda \Rightarrow (\rho_1, \sigma_1) \longleftrightarrow (\rho_2, \sigma_2). \quad (6)$$

Thus equality of a sufficient family of divergence is equivalent to interconvertibility. It is at first not clear that a sufficient family of divergences in fact exists, neither in the classical nor in the quantum case. As a first result, we prove that the classical Rényi divergences D_α constitute a sufficient family of divergences:

Theorem 1 (Sufficiency of Rényi divergences). *Let (X_i, μ_i) , $i = 1, 2$, be measure spaces and $p_i \ll q_i$ probability measures in $L^1(X_i, \mu_i)$. If there is an open interval $(a, b) \subset \mathbb{R}$ such that*

$$D_\alpha(p_1, q_1) = D_\alpha(p_2, q_2) < \infty \quad \forall \alpha \in (a, b), \quad (7)$$

there are stochastic maps between $L^1(X_1, \mu_1)$ and $L^1(X_2, \mu_2)$ interconverting the dichotomies (p_1, q_1) and (p_2, q_2) .

In particular this result holds for all probability distributions over finite sets. Since Rényi divergences are additive, one immediate consequence of Theorem 1 is that there is no non-trivial (*strict*) catalysis for interconversion of dichotomies: If $(p_1 \otimes r, q_1 \otimes s) \leftrightarrow (p_2 \otimes r, q_2 \otimes s)$ with $r \ll s$ and $D_\alpha(r, s) < \infty$, then also $(p_1, q_1) \leftrightarrow (p_2, q_2)$. This is noteworthy, because non-trivial cases of strict catalysis exist for one-sided conversion of dichotomies [24–26]: $(p_1 \otimes r, q_1 \otimes s) \rightarrow (p_2 \otimes r, q_2 \otimes r)$ does *not* imply $(p_1, q_1) \rightarrow (p_2, q_2)$. The existence of non-trivial examples of catalysis alone implies that no family of additive divergences can completely characterize whether a given dichotomy is more informative than another one [27].

Theorem 1 relies on observations relating Rényi divergences to the theory of Laplace transforms which we consider to be of independent interest. This connection gives rise to an infinite set of inequalities between Rényi divergences, which also hold true for the *Petz quantum Rényi divergence* D_α^P as well as the *maximal quantum Rényi divergence* D_α^{\max} in the quantum case (we refer to [28] for an introduction to the various different quantum Rényi divergences). As an example for these inequalities we find:

$$(-1)^n \frac{d^n}{d\alpha^n} \left(e^{(\alpha-1)(\mathbb{D}_\alpha(\rho,\sigma) - \mathbb{D}_\infty(\rho,\sigma))} \right) \geq 0 \quad \forall \alpha > 0, n \in \mathbb{N}, \quad (8)$$

if $\mathbb{D}_\alpha = D_\alpha^P, D_\alpha^{\max}$ and in the classical case (always assuming that $\mathbb{D}_\infty(\rho, \sigma)$ is finite). In fact we show that (8) is true for a sufficient family of Rényi divergences (should it exist) if and only if $[\rho, \sigma] = 0$. In particular neither the Petz- nor the maximal-Rényi divergence are sufficient. The reason is that both can be “simulated” by classical distributions.

Second, we conjecture that the *minimal quantum Rényi divergences* (also called *sandwiched quantum Rényi divergences*) D_α^{\min} provide a sufficient family of divergences for the case of finite-dimensional density matrices. To substantiate this conjecture we prove it for the case that both ρ_1 and ρ_2 are pure states as well as in the special case where ρ_1 is pure and $[\rho_2, \sigma_2] = 0$. In the latter case it then follows that $[\rho_1, \sigma_1] = 0$ and ρ_2 is pure as well. If our conjecture is true it follows that an abelian dichotomy cannot have the same minimal quantum Rényi divergences as any non-abelian dichotomy. In particular the latter would always violate at least one of the inequalities (8). We present some numerical evidence indicating that (8) indeed does not hold for the minimal quantum Rényi divergence in the case of non-abelian dichotomies.

Our result for classical states has a direct application in the context of resource theories [29]: The so-called resource theory of athermality [13, 14, 25, 30–32] deals with dichotomies where the second state σ is given by a Gibbs state $\omega_H := \exp(-\beta H)/Z$ of some Hamiltonian H with fixed inverse temperature $\beta > 0$ and all channels (free operations) must map Gibbs states to Gibbs states. In the case of abelian dichotomies (ρ, ω_H) , the Rényi divergences $D_\alpha(\rho, \omega_H)$ with $\alpha \geq 0$ can be interpreted as generalized free energies $F_\alpha(\rho, H)$ of ρ with respect to H . Our result then immediately implies that if $F_\alpha(\rho_1, H_1) = F_\alpha(\rho_2, H_2)$ for all $\alpha \geq 0$, then the two states are thermodynamically completely equivalent because they can be reversibly interconverted by thermodynamically free operations already in the single shot. If our conjecture holds true, then the same follows for general quantum states and the generalized free energies defined via the minimal quantum Rényi divergence if as free operations all quantum channels that fix the Gibbs state are considered, so-called Gibbs-preserving maps [33].

Structure of the paper: We first discuss the general structure of interconvertible sets of quantum states in Sec. 2 and then specialize to dichotomies and the associated Rényi divergences in Sec. 3. In Sec. 3.1 we prove the solution to the classical case. Starting from Sec. 3.2 we discuss the quantum case, which includes a discussion of the role of “complete monotonicity” leading to the inequalities (8) in Sec. 3.3 and a discussion of f -divergences in Sec. 3.4. In the Appendix, we discuss in detail the case of probability vectors. In particular, we also show that the question of convertibility of two dichotomies can be decided from the knowledge of the Rényi divergences for α in an open subset of $[0, \infty)$ alone.

2 Structure of interconvertible states

We will allow for possibly continuous classical systems and infinite-dimensional quantum systems. For a quantum system S we denote the Hilbert space by \mathcal{H}_S and the set of density operators on \mathcal{H}_S by $\mathfrak{S}(S)$. A classical system S is described by a σ -finite measure space (X, μ) . The state space is the set of probability distributions on a set X_S which are absolutely continuous with respect to the reference measure μ , i.e., $\mathfrak{S}(S)$ is the space of positive normalized elements of $L^1(X, \mu)$. We will usually identify an absolutely continuous measure with its corresponding μ -density and write $L^1(X, \mu)$ for both sets.

A *channel* between two systems S_i , $i = 1, 2$, is a linear¹ completely positive map $T : \mathfrak{S}(S_1) \rightarrow \mathfrak{S}(S_2)$. For quantum systems this means that T is a completely positive trace-preserving map $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{H}_{S_1}) \rightarrow \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{H}_{S_2})$ between the Banach spaces of trace class operators. For classical systems the definition is equivalent to that of a stochastic map. If one of the systems is quantum and the other one is classical, channels describe either measurements or preparations depending on which system is classical or quantum.

Definition 2. Consider two systems S_1 and S_2 and two families of states $\{\rho_\theta^{(i)}\}_{\theta \in \Theta} \subset \mathfrak{S}(S_i)$, $i = 1, 2$, indexed by a set Θ . We say that $\{\rho_\theta^{(1)}\}_{\theta \in \Theta}$ and $\{\rho_\theta^{(2)}\}_{\theta \in \Theta}$ are interconvertible and write

$$\{\rho_\theta^{(1)}\}_{\theta \in \Theta} \longleftrightarrow \{\rho_\theta^{(2)}\}_{\theta \in \Theta}, \quad (9)$$

if there are channels $T : \mathfrak{S}(S_1) \rightarrow \mathfrak{S}(S_2)$ and $R : \mathfrak{S}(S_2) \rightarrow \mathfrak{S}(S_1)$ so that $T(\rho_\theta^{(1)}) = \rho_\theta^{(2)}$, $R(\rho_\theta^{(2)}) = \rho_\theta^{(1)}$ for all $\theta \in \Theta$.

Note that the systems in Definition 2 can be classical or quantum systems. The main result of this section is a structure theorem for interconvertibility. To state it we need the following result known as the Koashi-Imoto Theorem (see [6]):

Theorem 3 (Koashi-Imoto). Let $\{\rho_\theta\}_{\theta \in \Theta}$ be a collection of states on a separable Hilbert space \mathcal{H} such that the union of the supports is (dense in) \mathcal{H} . Then \mathcal{H} decomposes as $\mathcal{H} = \bigoplus_{j=1}^N \mathcal{J}_j \otimes \mathcal{K}_j$, $N \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$, such that:

- The states ρ_θ decompose as

$$\rho_\theta = \bigoplus_j p_{j|\theta} \rho_{j|\theta} \otimes \omega_j, \quad (10)$$

where $\{p_{j|\theta}\}_j$ is a probability distribution, and $\rho_{j|\theta}$ is a density matrix for all $\theta \in \Theta$. Furthermore, ω_j are density matrices independent of θ .

- For every channel T on \mathcal{H} that leaves the ρ_θ invariant we have

$$T|_{\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{J}_j \otimes \mathcal{K}_j)} = \text{id} \otimes T_j, \quad (11)$$

with id on \mathcal{J}_j and T_j on \mathcal{K}_j and such that $T_j(\omega_j) = \omega_j$.

The original theorem was proved in the finite-dimensional case in [6]. An elegant algebraic proof is given in [34]. A proof of the infinite-dimensional case can be found in [7,

¹To be precise, we should say that T is affine, i.e., $T(p\rho + (1-p)\sigma) = pT(\rho) + (1-p)T(\sigma)$, $0 < p < 1$, $\rho, \sigma \in \mathfrak{S}(S_1)$. This, however, ensures that T can be extended to a linear map $T : \mathcal{A}_{S_1}^* \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_{S_2}^*$ between the dual spaces.

Sec. 3.3.] (in that reference Eq. (11) is not proved but it follows by the same argument as in the finite-dimensional case).

The family of states $\{\rho_\theta\}$ is interconvertible with the family of states $\{\hat{\rho}_\theta\}$ which is obtained from the Koashi-Imoto decomposition by $\hat{\rho}_\theta = \oplus_j p_{j|\theta} \rho_{j|\theta}$ on $\hat{\mathcal{H}} = \bigoplus_j \mathcal{J}_j$. We will call the family of states $\{\hat{\rho}_\theta\}$ the **Koashi-Imoto minimal form**. Explicit channels interconverting $\{\rho_\theta\}$ with its Koashi-Imoto minimal form are

$$\iota(\hat{\sigma}) = \oplus_j (P_{\mathcal{J}_j} \hat{\sigma} P_{\mathcal{J}_j}) \otimes \omega_j, \quad \text{and} \quad \pi(\sigma) = \oplus_j \text{tr}_{\mathcal{K}_j} [P_{\mathcal{K}_j \otimes \mathcal{J}_j} \sigma P_{\mathcal{K}_j \otimes \mathcal{J}_j}]. \quad (12)$$

Here, P_V denotes the orthogonal projection onto the subspace V . To be specific we have $\iota(\hat{\rho}_\theta) = \rho_\theta$ and $\pi(\rho_\theta) = \hat{\rho}_\theta$.

The following structure theorem says that two families of states are interconvertible if and only if they have unitarily equivalent Koashi-Imoto minimal forms.

Theorem 4. *Let $\{\rho_\theta^{(i)}\}_{\theta \in \Theta}$ be families of quantum states on quantum systems S_i , such that the union of the supports is all of \mathcal{H}_i , $i = 1, 2$. Consider the Koashi-Imoto decompositions*

$$\mathcal{H}_{S_i} = \bigoplus_{j=1}^{N_i} \mathcal{J}_j^{(i)} \otimes \mathcal{K}_j^{(i)}, \quad \rho_\theta^{(i)} = \oplus_{j=1}^{N_i} p_{j|\theta}^{(i)} \rho_{j|\theta}^{(i)} \otimes \omega_j^{(i)}, \quad \theta \in \Theta, i = 1, 2. \quad (13)$$

The following are equivalent

(A) $\{\rho_\theta^{(1)}\}$ and $\{\rho_\theta^{(2)}\}$ are interconvertible.

(B) There is a reordering of j -indices (and $N_1 = N_2$) such that $p_{j|\theta}^{(1)} = p_{j|\theta}^{(2)}$ and there are unitaries $U_j : \mathcal{J}_j^{(1)} \rightarrow \mathcal{J}_j^{(2)}$ so that $\rho_{j|\theta}^{(1)} = U_j \rho_{j|\theta}^{(2)} U_j^*$.

If the equivalent conditions hold and if T, R are channels that interconvert the sets of states, then it follows that

$$T|_{\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{J}_j^{(1)} \otimes \mathcal{K}_j^{(1)})} = (U_j \cdot U_j^*) \otimes T_j, \quad R|_{\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{J}_j^{(2)} \otimes \mathcal{K}_j^{(2)})} = (U_j^* \cdot U_j) \otimes R_j, \quad (14)$$

where the U_j are the unitaries from (B) and T_j and R_j are quantum channels with $T_j(\omega_j^{(1)}) = \omega_j^{(2)}$ and $R_j(\omega_j^{(2)}) = \omega_j^{(1)}$.

For finite-dimensional systems, this theorem is essentially a consequence of [4, Thm. 6]. We include a detailed proof which also covers infinite-dimensional systems in Appendix C. As an illustration we consider the question of interconvertibility of two families of qubit states:

Example 5. *Consider two collections of qubit states $\rho_\theta^{(i)} \in M_2(\mathbb{C})$, $i = 1, 2$. Then either the Koashi-Imoto decomposition of $\rho_\theta^{(i)}$ has a single direct summand or all states commute. In particular, the two families are interconvertible if and only if they are unitarily equivalent or if all states in each family are identical. The second case occurs if and only if for each family the (necessarily single) space \mathcal{K} is two-dimensional so that the \mathcal{J} space is trivial.*

One can see from Theorem 4 that a set of states $\{\rho_\theta\}$ is interconvertible with a set of commuting quantum states if and only if the ρ_θ are jointly diagonalizable. In fact, we can even rule out continuous classical systems:

Proposition 6. Let $\{\rho_\theta\}$ be a collection of states on a quantum system S (resp. finite-dimensional quantum system S). The following are equivalent

- (1) The states ρ_θ are pairwise commutative.
- (2) The Koashi-Imoto decomposition of \mathcal{H}_S has one-dimensional \mathcal{J}_j spaces (see Theorem 3).
- (3) $\{\rho_\theta\}$ is interconvertible with a set of commuting states on a quantum system (resp. finite-dimensional quantum system) S .
- (4) $\{\rho_\theta\}$ is interconvertible with a set of states on a (not necessarily discrete) classical system.
- (5) There is an entanglement-breaking channel $T : \mathfrak{S}(S) \rightarrow \mathfrak{S}(S)$ that has every ρ_θ as a fixpoint.

Remark 7. Point (2) implies that for commuting states $\{\rho_\theta\}_{\theta \in \Theta}$ the Koashi-Imoto minimal form $\hat{\rho}_\theta$ of ρ_θ is simply given by the probability distribution $\{p_{j|\theta}\}_{j=1}^N$. See also Appendix B for an explicit discussion of the Koashi-Imoto minimal form for finite-dimensional commuting states.

Proof. (2) \Rightarrow (1) is clear. The converse direction follows because any quantum channel on \mathcal{J}_j that fixes all states $\rho_{j|\theta}$ (for fixed j) must be the identity channel per definition of the spaces \mathcal{J}_j . Since we assume that all the $\rho_{j|\theta}$ commute, this requires $\dim \mathcal{J}_j = 1$. This and Theorem 4 also implies the equivalence of (1) and (2) with (3). The implication (3) \Rightarrow (4) is clear.

(4) \Leftrightarrow (5): The assumption of (4) guarantees that there is a channel $T : \mathfrak{S}(S) \rightarrow \mathfrak{S}(S)$ which has every ρ_θ as a fixed point and factorizes through a classical system. The result now follows from the fact channels factorize through a classical systems if and only if they are entanglement breaking. A proof for this which allows for continuous classical systems and infinite-dimensional quantum systems is given in [35, Thm. 2] (their assumption that the classical system is a complete separable metric space is not used in the part of the argument proving this claim).

(4) \Rightarrow (2): Let $\{p_\theta\}_{\theta \in \Theta}$ be a collection of states on a classical system described by $L^1(X, \mu)$ which are interconvertible with $\{\rho_\theta\}$. This means that the two von Neumann algebras with indexed families of states defined as $(\mathcal{M}_1, \{\sigma_\theta^{(1)}\}) := (L^\infty(X, \mu), \{p_\theta\})$ and $(\mathcal{M}_2, \{\sigma_\theta^{(2)}\}) := (\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_S), \{\rho_\theta\})$ are equivalent in the sense that there are normal unital completely positive maps in both direction which interconvert these states. It follows from a recent result in the theory of sufficient subalgebras [36] that the minimal sufficient subalgebras of \mathcal{M}_1 and \mathcal{M}_2 are isomorphic. These subalgebras are

$$\mathcal{N}_i = \bigcap_{\Phi \in \text{Ch}(\mathcal{M}_i)} \{x \in \mathcal{M} \mid \Phi^*(x) = x \text{ holds, if } \Phi(\sigma_\theta^{(i)}) = \sigma_\theta^{(i)} \forall \theta \in \Theta\},$$

where $\text{Ch}(\mathcal{M}_i)$ is the set channels on \mathcal{M}_i , i.e., of normal completely positive maps on the pre-dual $(\mathcal{M}_i)_*$ which take states to states. The restrictions of the $\sigma_\theta^{(2)} = \rho_\theta$ to \mathcal{N}_2 are just the minimal form obtained from the Koashi-Imoto decomposition of ρ_θ , meaning that $\mathcal{N}_2 = \bigoplus_j \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{J}_j)$. On the other hand, \mathcal{N}_1 is commutative since it is a subalgebra of $L^\infty(X, \mu)$. Since $\mathcal{N}_1 \cong \mathcal{N}_2$ all the \mathcal{J}_j spaces must hence be one-dimensional. \square

Proposition 6 can be interpreted as a generalization of the no-teleportation theorem as the latter is recovered if $\{\rho_\theta\}$ is the set of all states.

Remark 8. In the finite-dimensional case, there is a nice explicit proof of (5) \Rightarrow (3): That T is entanglement breaking implies that its Choi-Jamiolkowski matrix $\rho_T := (\text{id} \otimes T)(|\Omega\rangle\langle\Omega|)$ is separable so that we can write $\rho_T = \sum_{i=1}^r p_i \omega_i \otimes \tau_i$. Since T is trace-preserving we have $\sum_{i=1}^r p_i \omega_i = \mathbf{1}/d_S$. Defining the effect operators $E_i = p_i d_S \omega_i^\top$, where $^\top$ denotes the transposition induced by the choice of maximally entangled state $|\Omega\rangle$, we find that

$$T(\sigma) = d_S \text{tr}_1[(\sigma^\top \otimes \mathbf{1})\rho_T] = \sum_{i=1}^r \text{tr}[E_i \sigma] \tau_i. \quad (15)$$

Hence T is a measure-and-prepare channel with respect to the POVM $\{E_i\}$ and thus factorizes over the classical system $X = \{1, \dots, r\}$.

Corollary 9. Let $\{\rho_\theta^{(i)}\}$ be interconvertible collections of states on systems S_i , $i = 1, 2$. If the $\rho_\theta^{(1)}$ commute (e.g., if S_1 is a classical system), the states $\rho_\theta^{(2)}$ commute.

Proof. Assume that S_1 is a quantum system. By Proposition 6, commutativity of $\rho_\theta^{(1)}$ implies that the spaces $\mathcal{J}_j^{(i)}$ in Theorem 4 are of dimension 1. But said Theorem then implies that the same is true for $\rho_\theta^{(2)}$. Applying Proposition 6 a second time shows the assertion.

Now let S_1 be a classical system and let T, R be interconverting channels. Then $S = T \circ R : \mathfrak{S}(S_2) \rightarrow \mathfrak{S}(S_2)$ is a channel that factorizes over a classical system which has every $\rho_\theta^{(2)}$ as a fixpoint. The result follows from Proposition 6. \square

Remark 10. For pairs (ρ, σ) of finite-dimensional density matrices Corollary 9 can also be deduced from [37, Thm. 6].

3 Dichotomies: Sufficient families of Rényi divergences

For this section we restrict to interconvertibility in the case of $|\Theta| = 2$. That is we consider two dichotomies (ρ_i, σ_i) , $i = 1, 2$, of states and ask whether there exist channels T and R mapping between the two systems such that

$$\begin{aligned} T(\rho_1) &= \rho_2, & R(\rho_2) &= \rho_1, \\ T(\sigma_1) &= \sigma_2, & R(\sigma_2) &= \sigma_1. \end{aligned}$$

We are interested in examining the connection of this problem to suitable families of (quantum) Rényi divergences. For this reason we will always make the following assumption when talking about dichotomies:

Assumption. In the main text we only consider dichotomies (ρ, σ) with $\rho \ll \sigma$. For quantum states this means that $\text{supp}(\rho) \subseteq \text{supp}(\sigma)$ while it means that ρ is absolutely continuous with respect to σ (in the sense of measures) for classical systems. The classical case is treated without the assumption on absolute continuity in Appendix A.

Here, a family of Rényi divergences means functions $\mathbb{D}_\alpha(\rho, \sigma)$ defined for pairs of states with $\text{supp}(\rho) \subseteq \text{supp}(\sigma)$ and certain values of α and which satisfies certain axioms [28,

Sec. 4.2]. For us, the most important properties a family of Rényi divergences has to satisfy are the *data processing inequality*,

$$\mathbb{D}_\alpha(T(\rho), T(\sigma)) \leq \mathbb{D}_\alpha(\rho, \sigma), \quad (16)$$

which should hold on a subset $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{R}$ (independent of (ρ, σ)), and the property that for commuting states one recovers the classical Rényi divergences, i.e., if $\rho = \sum p_i |i\rangle\langle i|$, $\sigma_i = \sum q_i |i\rangle\langle i|$ then $\mathbb{D}_\alpha(\rho, \sigma) = D_\alpha(p, q)$, where

$$D_\alpha(p, q) = \frac{1}{\alpha - 1} \log \sum p_i^\alpha q_i^{1-\alpha}. \quad (17)$$

The most important families are:

1. The *Petz quantum Rényi divergence*, defined as

$$D_\alpha^P(\rho, \sigma) = \frac{1}{\alpha - 1} \log \text{tr}[\rho^\alpha \sigma^{1-\alpha}], \quad (18)$$

where $\sigma^{1-\alpha}$ denotes the *pseudo-inverse* of σ . D_α^P satisfies the DPI on $\Lambda = [0, 2]$ [28, Sec. 4.4], see also Section 3.4.

2. The *minimal quantum Rényi divergence* (or sandwiched Rényi divergence) given by

$$D_\alpha^{\min}(\rho, \sigma) = \frac{1}{\alpha - 1} \log \text{tr}[(\sigma^{\frac{1-\alpha}{2\alpha}} \rho \sigma^{\frac{1-\alpha}{2\alpha}})^\alpha] =: \frac{1}{\alpha - 1} \log Q_\alpha^{\min}(\rho, \sigma), \quad (19)$$

which satisfies the DPI on $\Lambda = [\frac{1}{2}, \infty)$ [28, Sec. 4.3][37]. The name is referring to the fact that among all families of Rényi divergences, the minimal quantum Rényi divergence is the smallest [28, Sec. 4.2].

3. The *maximal quantum Rényi divergence*

$$D_\alpha^{\max}(\rho, \sigma) = \frac{1}{\alpha - 1} \log \text{tr}[\sigma(\sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}} \rho \sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}})^\alpha]. \quad (20)$$

It satisfies the DPI on $\Lambda = [0, 2]$ (and is also only maximal on this region) [23, Thm. 4.4], [28, Sec. 4.2.3], see also Section 3.4.

All three divergences are additive. Furthermore D_α^{\min} and D_α^P coincide in the limits $\alpha \rightarrow 1, \infty$ (if the limits exist) [28]:

$$\lim_{\alpha \rightarrow \infty} D_\alpha^{\min}(\rho, \sigma) = \lim_{\alpha \rightarrow \infty} D_\alpha^P(\rho, \sigma) =: D_\infty(\rho, \sigma) \quad (21)$$

and

$$\lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 1} D_\alpha^{\min}(\rho, \sigma) = \lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 1} D_\alpha^P(\rho, \sigma) = D(\rho, \sigma). \quad (22)$$

The *quantum max-divergence* $D_\infty(\rho, \sigma)$ can be defined as $D_\infty(\rho, \sigma) = \inf\{\lambda : \rho \leq \exp(\lambda)\sigma\}$. In contrast to the minimal and Petz quantum Rényi divergences, the maximal quantum Rényi divergence has the limit [28]

$$\lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 1} D_\alpha^{\max}(\rho, \sigma) = \text{tr}[\rho \log(\rho^{\frac{1}{2}} \sigma^{-1} \rho^{\frac{1}{2}})] =: D_{\text{BS}}(\rho, \sigma), \quad (23)$$

where $D_{\text{BS}}(\rho, \sigma)$ is known as Belavkin-Staszewski relative entropy [38]. It fulfills $D(\rho, \sigma) \leq D_{\text{BS}}(\rho, \sigma)$ with equality if and only if the density matrices commute [23]. A class of Rényi divergences that generalizes both the minimal quantum Rényi divergence as well as the Petz quantum Rényi divergence is the two-parameter α - z *quantum Rényi divergence* [39], defined as

$$D_{\alpha,z}(\rho, \sigma) = \frac{1}{\alpha - 1} \log \text{tr} \left[\left(\sigma^{\frac{1-\alpha}{2z}} \rho^{\frac{\alpha}{z}} \sigma^{\frac{1-\alpha}{2z}} \right)^z \right]. \quad (24)$$

For $z = \alpha$ it coincides with the minimal quantum Rényi divergence while for $z = 1$ it coincides with the Petz quantum Rényi divergence.

Definition 11. Let \mathbb{D}_α be a family of Rényi divergences that fulfills data-processing for a subset $\Lambda \subseteq [0, \infty)$. We say that the family \mathbb{D}_α is **sufficient** if the following holds: Let (ρ_1, σ_1) and (ρ_2, σ_2) be dichotomies on systems S_1 and S_2 such that $\mathbb{D}_\alpha(\rho_i, \sigma_i)$ is finite for all α in an open subset interval $(a, b) \subset \Lambda$. Then the dichotomies are interconvertible if and only if all their Rényi divergences are equal:

$$(\rho_1, \sigma_1) \leftrightarrow (\rho_2, \sigma_2) \iff \mathbb{D}_\alpha(\rho_1, \sigma_1) = \mathbb{D}_\alpha(\rho_2, \sigma_2) \quad \forall \alpha \in (a, b) \subset \Lambda.$$

As an illustration of the problem and to see that it does not admit a trivial *positive* answer, we will apply Corollary 9 to the Petz quantum Rényi divergences.

Proposition 12. *Neither the Petz quantum Rényi divergences nor the maximal Rényi divergence are sufficient.*

For the Petz quantum Rényi divergence this follows from Corollary 9 since for every pair of quantum states there exist probability distributions, i.e. classical states, with the same Rényi divergences. They are known as the *Nussbaum-Szkoła distributions* [40]. The same argument (with different classical states) works for the maximal Rényi divergence. In fact, both families arise in the context of *quantum f -divergences* [23] and we will show corresponding no-go results in Section 3.2.

However, for $\alpha \in [1/2, 1) \cup (1, \infty)$ we have $D_\alpha^{\text{min}}(\rho, \sigma) \leq D_\alpha^P(\rho, \sigma)$ with equality if and only if $[\rho, \sigma] = 0$ (as seen above, the two quantities coincide for arbitrary dichotomies in the limits $\alpha \rightarrow 1, \infty$). This follows from the Araki-Lieb-Thirring inequality [41, 42] and its equality conditions [43], see also [44, 45]. Since we cannot use the Nussbaum-Szkoła distributions to show an analogous statement for D_α^{min} , this family might therefore still be sufficient. In fact, we show in Sec. 3.2 for a restricted class of non-commuting states that there cannot exist any (sufficiently regular) probability measure with matching Rényi divergences. This leads us to our conjecture:

Conjecture 13. *The minimal quantum Rényi divergence is a sufficient family of Rényi divergences.*

In the remaining sections we will be concerned with further examining this conjecture. More precisely, we will prove it for classical systems and in certain special cases for quantum systems.

3.1 Solution for the classical case

For classical systems there is a unique family of Rényi divergences, given by

$$D_\alpha(p, q) = \frac{1}{\alpha - 1} \log \int_X \left(\frac{dp}{dq} \right)^\alpha dq \quad \text{if } p \ll q. \quad (25)$$

where p, q are both probability measures on a space X . As already stated the conjecture is true for dichotomies on (possibly continuous) classical systems. Recall that by $L^1(X, \mu)$ we denote the μ -absolutely continuous measures as well as their μ -densities at the same time. For convenience we state the theorem again:

Theorem 1 (Sufficiency of Rényi divergences). *Let (X_i, μ_i) , $i = 1, 2$, be σ -finite measure spaces and $p_i \ll q_i$ probability measures in $L^1(X_i, \mu_i)$. If there is an open interval $(a, b) \subset \mathbb{R}$ such that*

$$D_\alpha(p_1, q_1) = D_\alpha(p_2, q_2) < \infty \quad \forall \alpha \in (a, b), \quad (26)$$

there are stochastic maps between $L^1(X_1, \mu_1)$ and $L^1(X_2, \mu_2)$ interconverting the dichotomies (p_1, q_1) and (p_2, q_2) .

Corollary 14. *Let $\mathbf{p}_i, \mathbf{q}_i \in \mathbb{R}^{n_i}$, $i = 1, 2$, be probability vectors (with $\mathbf{p}_i \ll \mathbf{q}_i$). Then there are stochastic matrices $T \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1 \times n_2}$ and $R \in \mathbb{R}^{n_2 \times n_1}$ so that $T\mathbf{p}_1 = \mathbf{p}_2$, $T\mathbf{q}_1 = \mathbf{q}_2$, $R\mathbf{p}_2 = \mathbf{p}_1$ and $R\mathbf{q}_2 = \mathbf{q}_1$ if and only if $D_\alpha(\mathbf{p}_1, \mathbf{q}_1) = D_\alpha(\mathbf{p}_2, \mathbf{q}_2)$ for an open set of α .*

In Appendix B we discuss the setting of probability vectors in more detail and show how to construct the matrices T and R explicitly.

We briefly comment on the existence of the Rényi divergences for continuous distributions. As the integrand in Eq. (25) is positive, the Rényi divergences $D_\alpha(p, q)$ make sense in $[0, \infty]$ for all $\alpha \in [0, \infty)$ if $p \ll q$. At $\alpha = 1$ the Rényi divergence agrees with the relative entropy (or Kullback-Leibler divergence) $\int \log(\frac{dp}{dq}) dp$. In the following we use the notation

$$Q_\alpha(p, q) = e^{(\alpha-1)D_\alpha(p, q)} = \int \left(\frac{dp}{dq}\right)^\alpha dq. \quad (27)$$

These quantities also make sense for all $\alpha < 0$ (but may be infinite) if we define $(\frac{dp}{dq})^\alpha$ as the *pseudo-inverse*. If one has $p \ll q$ and $q \ll p$ then it follows that $(\frac{dp}{dq})^{-\alpha} = (\frac{dq}{dp})^\alpha$ for all $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$. In this case it holds that $Q_\alpha(p, q) = Q_{1-\alpha}(q, p)$ and $D_\alpha(p, q) = \frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha} D_{1-\alpha}(q, p)$.

Before we give the proof of Theorem 1 we need the concept of the *push-forward measure* from measure theory [46]. Let (X_i, \mathcal{A}_i) be measurable spaces and let $f : X_1 \rightarrow X_2$ be a measurable function. If q is a measure of X_1 , then the push-forward measure $f_*(q)$ is defined by $f_*(q)(A) = q(f^{-1}(A))$. One has $g \in L^1(X_2, f_*(q))$ if and only if $g \circ f \in L^1(X_1, q)$. In this case it holds that

$$\int_{X_2} g df_*(q) = \int_{X_1} g \circ f dq. \quad (28)$$

For the proof of Theorem 1, we need the following Lemma

Lemma 15. *Let μ_1, μ_2 be finite Borel measures on \mathbb{R} . If there are $a < b \in \mathbb{R}$ so that*

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-\alpha t} d\mu_1(t) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-\alpha t} d\mu_2(t) < \infty \quad \forall \alpha \in (a, b), \quad (29)$$

then $\mu_1 = \mu_2$.

Proof. Set $\mu = \mu_1 - \mu_2$. For $\alpha \in (a, b)$ the function $t \mapsto e^{-\alpha t}$ is in $L^1(\mathbb{R}, |\mu|)$ (because $|\mu| \leq \mu_1 + \mu_2$). The same holds for complex α if $a < \operatorname{Re}(\alpha) < b$. The Laplace transform $\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-\alpha t} d\mu(t)$ is analytic in the strip with real part in (a, b) and, by assumption, equal to zero on this strip. Pick $c \in (a, b)$ and consider the finite Borel measure $\nu = e^{-ct} d\mu(t)$ whose Fourier transform is $\hat{\nu}(\xi) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-(c+i\xi)t} d\mu(t)$ and hence vanishes for all ξ . Injectivity of the Fourier transform implies $\nu = 0$ and hence $\mu_1 = \mu_2$. \square

This Lemma is an injectivity statement for the two-sided Laplace transform. While this is surely known, we could not find this precise statement in the literature. We will now give the proof of Theorem 1 in three steps.

1. A dichotomy (p, q) in $L^1(X, \mu)$ is interconvertible with the same dichotomy viewed as an element of $L^1(X, q)$ and both have the same Rényi divergences.

Proof. To see the claim we consider the stochastic map $T : L^1(X, q) \rightarrow L^1(X, \mu)$ defined by multiplication with the Radon-Nikodym derivative $\frac{dq}{d\mu}$. This map takes $\frac{dp}{dq} \equiv p \in L^1(X, q)$ to $\frac{dp}{d\mu} \equiv p \in L^1(X, \mu)$ and $1 \equiv q$ to $\frac{dq}{d\mu} \equiv q$. A stochastic map in the other direction is given by multiplication with the pseudo-inverse $(\frac{dq}{d\mu})^{-1}$. This shows that the dichotomies (p, q) viewed as element of these two different L^1 spaces are interconvertible. It is also clear that the Rényi divergence is the same for both L^1 -spaces. \square

2. Every dichotomy (p, q) on $L^1(X, q)$ is interconvertible with a dichotomy (\tilde{p}, \tilde{q}) on $L^1((-\infty, \infty], \tilde{q})$ such that $\frac{d\tilde{p}}{d\tilde{q}}(t) = e^{-t}$.

Proof. Set $f = -\log(\frac{dp}{dq}) : X \rightarrow (-\infty, \infty]$. Define $\tilde{q} := f_*(q)$ as the push-forward measure of q under f . We may consider the push-forward as a stochastic map $f_* : L^1(X, q) \rightarrow L^1((-\infty, \infty], \tilde{q})$. This definition makes use of the fact that all elements in $L^1(X, q)$ may be regarded as measures on X (which are absolutely continuous with respect to q), the proper definition in terms of densities is $f_* : L^1(X, q) \ni g \mapsto \frac{df_*(gq)}{d\tilde{q}} \in L^1((-\infty, \infty], \tilde{q})$. Set $\tilde{p} = f_*(p)$. By construction it holds that $\frac{d\tilde{p}}{d\tilde{q}}(t) = e^{-t}$:

$$\tilde{p}(A) = p(f^{-1}(A)) = \int_{f^{-1}(A)} \frac{dp}{dq} dq = \int_{f^{-1}(A)} e^{-f} dq = \int_A e^{-t} d\tilde{q}(t) \quad (30)$$

for all Borel measurable $A \subset \mathbb{R}$. The Rényi divergences of (\tilde{p}, \tilde{q}) are equal to those of (p, q) since

$$\begin{aligned} Q_\alpha(\tilde{p}, \tilde{q}) &= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{d\tilde{p}}{d\tilde{q}}(t)^\alpha d\tilde{q}(t) \\ &= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-\alpha t} d\tilde{q}(t) \\ &= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-\alpha f((dp/dq)(x))} dq(x) \\ &= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \left(\frac{dp}{dq}\right)^\alpha dq = Q_\alpha(p, q). \end{aligned}$$

We now define a stochastic map $R : L^1((-\infty, \infty], \tilde{q}) \rightarrow L^1(X, q)$ as $g \mapsto R(g) = g \circ f$. This definition uses that elements of L^1 spaces are essentially functions (in contrast to the other definitions where we viewed them as measures). From the definition it is clear that R preserves positivity and that $R(g)$ is always measurable. Since $\tilde{q} = f_*(q)$, R satisfies $\int R(g) dq = \int g d\tilde{q}$ and hence maps probability densities to probability densities (therefore, R is indeed a stochastic map). It remains to be shown

that R maps the dichotomy (\tilde{p}, \tilde{q}) to (p, q) . In terms of densities this means that $R(t \mapsto e^{-t}) = \frac{dp}{dq}$ and $R1 = 1$ q -almost everywhere. The latter is clear and the former is readily checked:

$$\int_A R(t \mapsto e^{-t})dq = \int_A e^{-f(x)}dq(x) = \int_A \frac{dp}{dq}dq = p(A). \quad (31)$$

□

It may be instructive to see the explicit form of \tilde{p}, \tilde{q} for the case that p, q are given by finite probability distributions $\{p_i\}_{i=1}^n, \{q_i\}_{i=1}^n$. We then have $(dp/dq)_i = p_i/q_i$ and hence:

$$\tilde{p}(x) = \sum_{i=1}^n p_i \delta(x + \log(p_i/q_i)), \quad \tilde{q}(x) = \sum_{i=1}^n q_i \delta(x + \log(p_i/q_i)). \quad (32)$$

Since $\exp(-x) = p_i/q_i$ for $x = -\log(p_i/q_i)$, $\tilde{p}(x) = e^{-x}\tilde{q}(x)$ can be seen from

$$\begin{aligned} \int h(x)d\tilde{p}(x) &= \sum_i p_i h(-\log(p_i/q_i)) = \sum_i q_i \exp(\log(p_i/q_i)) h(-\log(p_i/q_i)) \\ &= \int h(x)e^{-x}d\tilde{q}(x) \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

for all functions h . In Appendix B we discuss the Koashi-Imoto minimal form of pairs of probability vectors in detail. Comparison shows that the measures \tilde{p}, \tilde{q} precisely correspond to the Koashi-Imoto minimal form.

- Two pairs of Borel probability measures of the form (p_i, q_i) on $(-\infty, \infty]$ that satisfy $\frac{dp_i}{dq_i}(t) = e^{-t}$ are equal if and only if they have the same Rényi divergences, provided that these are finite on some open interval.

Proof. The Rényi divergence of (p_i, q_i) is essentially just the two-sided Laplace transform of q_i :

$$Q_\alpha(p_i, q_i) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-\alpha t} dq_i(t) = \mathcal{L}(q_i)(\alpha).$$

By the injectivity of the Laplace transform (see Lemma 15) it follows that $q_1 = q_2$. Since $\frac{dp_i}{dq_i}(t) = e^{-t}$ it also follows that $p_1 = p_2$. □

3.2 Quantum case: Conjecture

Spelling out our conjecture for the quantum case gives:

Conjecture 16. *Let (ρ_1, σ_1) and (ρ_2, σ_2) be pairs of density operators on quantum system S_1 and S_2 . Let (a, b) , $\frac{1}{2} \leq a < b$, be any interval on which the minimal quantum Rényi divergences of both dichotomies are finite. Then the dichotomies are interconvertible if and only if they have the same minimal quantum Rényi divergences on this interval, i.e.,*

$$(\rho_1, \sigma_1) \leftrightarrow (\rho_2, \sigma_2) \iff D_\alpha^{\min}(\rho_1, \sigma_1) = D_\alpha^{\min}(\rho_2, \sigma_2) < \infty \quad \forall \alpha \in (a, b). \quad (34)$$

Corollary 17 (No catalysis). *If Conjecture 16 is true and $D_\alpha^{\min}(\rho_1 \otimes \omega, \sigma_1 \otimes \chi) < \infty$ for $\alpha \in (a, b)$,*

$$(\rho_1 \otimes \omega, \sigma_1 \otimes \chi) \leftrightarrow (\rho_2 \otimes \omega, \sigma_2 \otimes \chi) \quad \Rightarrow \quad (\rho_1, \sigma_1) \leftrightarrow (\rho_2, \sigma_2). \quad (35)$$

We believe that this no-catalysis corollary could be proven independently (without first proving Conjecture 16) using the normal form for interconvertible dichotomies, see Section 2. On the other hand, we are not aware of a proof for the corresponding classical no-catalysis result which does not already also essentially imply the sufficiency of Rényi divergences. We therefore leave it as an open problem.

In general $D_\alpha^{\min}(\rho, \sigma) \neq D_\alpha^{\min}(\sigma, \rho)$. We have stated the conjecture with only one ordering of the states in the Rényi divergences as this is sufficient in the classical case. Indeed, for commuting states we have

$$D_\alpha^{\min}(\rho, \sigma) = \frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha} D_{1-\alpha}^{\min}(\sigma, \rho) \quad (36)$$

if $\rho \ll \sigma \ll \rho$. Therefore, as long as the Rényi divergence is finite for $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ it is not necessary to consider both orderings explicitly. It can be shown that this relation holds *if and only if* $[\rho, \sigma] = 0$ using the Araki-Lieb-Thirring inequality and its equality condition. In particular, if one demands $D_\alpha^{\min}(\rho_1, \sigma_1) = D_\alpha^{\min}(\rho_2, \sigma_2)$ and $D_\alpha^{\min}(\sigma_1, \rho_1) = D_\alpha^{\min}(\sigma_2, \rho_2)$, then $[\rho_1, \sigma_1] = 0$ implies $[\rho_2, \sigma_2] = 0$. We prove a (much) weaker statement of this form, see Lemma 20 below. This may indicate that the corresponding quantum result requires a condition about equality of Rényi divergences with respect to both orderings.

We will now present affirmative results to weaker statements supporting the idea that Conjecture 16 should be true. We say that the conjecture holds for two pairs of states (or for a certain class of pairs of states) if (34) holds for these states. As a corollary of the complete solution for the classical case we get:

Lemma 18. *The conjecture holds for commuting pairs of states.*

Under the additional assumption that one state is pure, the conjecture is true:

Lemma 19. *The conjecture is true for pairs (ρ_1, σ_1) and (ρ_2, σ_2) of density operators if the $\rho_i = |\psi^{(i)}\rangle\langle\psi^{(i)}|$ are pure states.*

Lemma 20. *Let (ρ_1, σ_1) and (ρ_2, σ_2) be pairs of density operators with equal minimal quantum Rényi divergences on finite-dimensional quantum systems. If (ρ_1, σ_1) commute and ρ_2 is pure, the conjecture is true.*

Remark 21. We comment on the implications of Lemmas 19 and 20: One should take Lemma 19 with a grain of salt as it is also true for the Petz quantum Rényi divergences (with a similar proof). Lemma 20 however is false for the Petz quantum Rényi divergence (and by the same argument also for D_α^{\max}). This is a consequence of the existence of the Nussbaum-Skoła distributions P and Q as defined in Section 3.4. As noted before (see Proposition 12 and after), their Petz quantum Rényi divergences coincide with those of (ρ, σ) but they cannot be interconvertible. Since for non-commuting ρ and σ the distribution P is never pure and $D_\alpha^P(\rho, \sigma) > D_\alpha^{\min}(\rho, \sigma)$ this is not in conflict with the validity of Lemma 19 for D_α^P nor with Lemma 20.

Remark 22 (α - z Rényi divergences). As discussed above, the α - z quantum Rényi divergence generalizes the minimal and Petz quantum Rényi divergences. If we formulate the conjecture in terms of the α - z Rényi divergence instead of D_α^{\min} we obtain a stronger statement

than Lemma 20: Suppose that $D_{\alpha,z}(\rho_1, \sigma_1) = D_{\alpha,z}(\rho_2, \sigma_2)$ for the values $(\alpha, z) = (\alpha^*, \alpha^*)$ and $(\alpha, z) = (\alpha^*, 1)$ with $\alpha^* \in [1/2, 1)$ and moreover $[\rho_1, \sigma_1] = 0$. Then we can deduce already that $[\rho_2, \sigma_2] = 0$ even if ρ_2 is not pure. To see this, note that (since $[\rho_1, \sigma_1] = 0$)

$$D_{\alpha,z}(\rho_1, \sigma_1) = D_{\alpha}^P(\rho_1, \sigma_1) = D_{\alpha}^{\min}(\rho_1, \sigma_1) \quad (37)$$

and $D_{\alpha,\alpha}(\rho_2, \sigma_2) = D_{\alpha}^{\min}(\rho_2, \sigma_2)$, $D_{\alpha,1}(\rho_2, \sigma_2) = D_{\alpha}^P(\rho_2, \sigma_2)$. Therefore

$$D_{\alpha^*}^P(\rho_2, \sigma_2) = D_{\alpha^*}^P(\rho_1, \sigma_1) = D_{\alpha^*}^{\min}(\rho_1, \sigma_1) = D_{\alpha^*}^{\min}(\rho_2, \sigma_2), \quad (38)$$

which is only possible if $[\rho_2, \sigma_2] = 0$. It is therefore conceivable that Conjecture 16 is true for the α - z quantum Rényi divergence but not for the minimal quantum Rényi divergence.

Lemmas 19 and 20 both deal with a dichotomy (ρ, σ) where ρ is pure. Let us therefore first evaluate the minimal quantum Rényi divergence for this special case. It is useful to define the quantity

$$Q_{\alpha}^{\min}(\rho, \sigma) = \text{tr}[(\sigma^{\frac{1-\alpha}{2\alpha}} \rho \sigma^{\frac{1-\alpha}{2\alpha}})^{\alpha}] = \text{tr}[(\rho^{\frac{1}{2}} \sigma^{\frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha}} \rho^{\frac{1}{2}})^{\alpha}], \quad (39)$$

so that $D_{\alpha}^{\min}(\rho, \sigma) = (\alpha - 1)^{-1} \log Q_{\alpha}^{\min}(\rho, \sigma)$. The second equality is seen as follows: Set $A = \sigma^{\frac{1-\alpha}{2\alpha}} \rho^{\frac{1}{2}}$ and use that the singular value decomposition implies $\text{tr}[(A^* A)^{\alpha}] = \text{tr}[(A A^*)^{\alpha}]$. If $\rho = |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$ is pure and $\sigma = \sum q_i P_i$, then

$$Q_{\alpha}^{\min}(\rho, \sigma) = \langle\psi, \sigma^{\frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha}} \psi\rangle^{\alpha} = \left(\sum p_i q_i^{\frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha}}\right)^{\alpha} = \left(\sum \frac{p_i}{q_i} q_i^{1/\alpha}\right)^{\alpha}, \quad (40)$$

where we used the shorthand $p_i = \langle\psi, P_i \psi\rangle$.

Proof of Lemma 19. For $j = 1, 2$ let $\rho_j = |\psi^{(j)}\rangle\langle\psi^{(j)}|$ with $|\psi^{(j)}\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_j$ and $\sigma_j = \sum_{i=1}^{n_j} q_i^{(j)} P_i^{(j)}$ with $P_i^{(j)}$ being the spectral projectors of σ_j and $\{q_i^{(j)}\}_{i=1}^{n_j}$ the spectrum of σ_j . Note that n_j counts the number of distinct eigenvalues of the state σ_j and not the dimension of \mathcal{H}_j . We further define the sub-normalized vectors $|\psi_i^{(j)}\rangle = P_i^{(j)} |\psi^{(j)}\rangle$ with associated norms

$$p_i^{(j)} = \|\psi_i^{(j)}\|^2 = \langle\psi^{(j)} | P_i^{(j)} | \psi^{(j)}\rangle. \quad (41)$$

Finally, denote by $R^{(j)}$ the orthonormal projectors onto $\text{span}\{|\psi_i^{(j)}\rangle\}_{i=1}^{n_j}$. By construction we have $[R^{(j)}, \sigma^{(j)}] = 0$ and $R^{(j)} |\psi^{(j)}\rangle = |\psi^{(j)}\rangle$. Now let $D_{\alpha}^{\min}(\rho_1, \sigma_1) = D_{\alpha}^{\min}(\rho_2, \sigma_2)$ for all α in some open subset of $(1, \infty)$. Using (40) we obtain

$$\sum_i \left(\frac{p_i^{(1)}}{q_i^{(1)}}\right) q_i^{(1)\frac{1}{\alpha}} = \sum_i \left(\frac{p_i^{(2)}}{q_i^{(2)}}\right) q_i^{(2)\frac{1}{\alpha}} \quad (42)$$

on some open subset of $(1, \infty)$. Both sides are analytic in α and can be analytically continued to all $\alpha > 0$. The equality then extends to all $\alpha > 0$. Substituting $1/\alpha \mapsto \alpha$, we get for all $\alpha > 0$

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n_1} \left(\frac{p_i^{(1)}}{q_i^{(1)}}\right) q_i^{(1)\alpha} = \sum_{i=1}^{n_2} \left(\frac{p_i^{(2)}}{q_i^{(2)}}\right) q_i^{(2)\alpha}. \quad (43)$$

Since exponential functions $x \mapsto \exp(ax)$ with distinct a are linearly independent and the $q_i^{(j)}$ are distinct for fixed j , we find that $n_1 = n_2$ and that there exists a permutation π such that:

$$q_j^{(2)} = q_{\pi(j)}^{(1)}, \quad p_j^{(2)} = p_{\pi(j)}^{(1)}. \quad (44)$$

From now on we relabel the indices so that $\pi = \text{Id}$. By construction we have

$$R^{(1)}\sigma_1 = \sum_j \frac{q_j^{(1)}}{p_j^{(1)}} |\psi_j\rangle\langle\psi_j|, \quad R^{(2)}\sigma_2 = \sum_j \frac{q_j^{(2)}}{p_j^{(2)}} |\phi_j\rangle\langle\phi_j|. \quad (45)$$

Eqs. (41) and (44) imply that there exists a unitary operator $U : R^{(1)}\mathcal{H}_1 \rightarrow R^{(2)}\mathcal{H}_2$ such that

$$U|\psi^{(1)}\rangle = |\psi^{(2)}\rangle, \quad UR^{(1)}\sigma_1 R^{(1)U*} = R^{(2)}\sigma_2 R^{(2)}. \quad (46)$$

Furthermore

$$\text{tr}[(\mathbf{1} - R^{(1)})\sigma_1] = 1 - \sum_j q_j^{(1)} = 1 - \sum_j q_j^{(2)} = \text{tr}[(\mathbf{1} - R^{(2)})\sigma_2]. \quad (47)$$

Hence there exist trace-preserving completely positive maps $\tilde{T} : \mathcal{L}((\mathbf{1} - R^{(1)})\mathcal{H}_1) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}((\mathbf{1} - R^{(2)})\mathcal{H}_2)$ and $\tilde{S} : \mathcal{L}((\mathbf{1} - R^{(2)})\mathcal{H}_2) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}((\mathbf{1} - R^{(1)})\mathcal{H}_1)$ such that

$$\tilde{T}((\mathbf{1} - R^{(1)})\sigma_1) = (\mathbf{1} - R^{(2)})\sigma_2 \quad (48)$$

$$\tilde{S}((\mathbf{1} - R^{(2)})\sigma_2) = (\mathbf{1} - R^{(1)})\sigma_1. \quad (49)$$

We can hence define the quantum channels $T : \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_1) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_2)$ and $S : \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_2) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_1)$ by

$$T(a) := UR^{(1)}aR^{(1)U*} + \tilde{T}((\mathbf{1} - R^{(1)})a(\mathbf{1} - R^{(1)})) \quad (50)$$

$$S(b) := U^*R^{(2)}bR^{(2)U} + \tilde{S}((\mathbf{1} - R^{(2)})b(\mathbf{1} - R^{(2)})), \quad (51)$$

which fulfill

$$T(\rho_1) = \rho_2, \quad S(\rho_2) = \rho_1, \quad T(\sigma_1) = \sigma_2, \quad S(\sigma_2) = \sigma_1. \quad (52)$$

□

Remark 23. The above proof of Lemma 19 can also be carried out if \mathcal{H}_j are infinite-dimensional provided that $D_\alpha(\rho_j, \sigma_j)$ are finite for all $\alpha > 1$. This is not always the case. To see this, first note that any two discrete probability distributions $p, q \in \ell^1$ with $p \ll q$ may arise from a suitable pure state $|\psi\rangle$ and mixed state σ . For example, consider

$$p_i = \frac{6}{\pi^2} \frac{1}{i^2}, \quad q_i = \frac{1}{\zeta(2+s)} \frac{1}{i^{2+s}}, \quad (53)$$

where ζ is the Riemann-Zeta function. Then

$$D_\alpha^{\min}(\rho, \sigma) = \log(\zeta(2+s)) + \frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1} \log\left(\frac{6}{\pi^2} \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} i^{-\frac{2+s-\alpha s}{\alpha}}\right), \quad (54)$$

which diverges for $\alpha \geq \frac{2+s}{1+s}$. Incidentally, the Petz quantum Rényi divergence in this case is given by

$$D_\alpha^P(\rho, \sigma) = \log(\zeta(2+s)) + \frac{1}{\alpha-1} \log\left(\frac{6}{\pi^2} \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} i^{-(2+(1-\alpha)(2+s))}\right), \quad (55)$$

which converges if and only if $\alpha < \frac{3+s}{2+s}$. Thus, for $\alpha \in (\frac{3+s}{2+s}, \frac{2+s}{1+s})$ the Petz quantum Rényi divergence is infinite while the minimal quantum Rényi divergence is finite, showing that their difference is in general unbounded.

Lemma 20 will follow from the following more general statement:

Lemma 24. *Let $\rho \ll \sigma$ be finite-dimensional quantum states with ρ being pure and $[\rho, \sigma] \neq 0$. Then there is no classical system with probability distributions $p \ll q$ and $(\frac{dp}{dq})^{\pm 1} \in L^\infty(q)$ (pseudo-inverse!) with $D_\alpha(p, q) = D_\alpha^{\min}(\rho, \sigma)$.*

For the proof of Lemma 24 we use the following argument: The function $Q_\alpha^{\min}(\rho, \sigma)$ can be extended to a meromorphic function on \mathbb{C} which has an essential singularity at the origin if and only if ρ and σ do not commute. The assumptions that the Radon-Nikodym derivative is essentially bounded from above and below will however imply that $Q_\alpha(p, q)$ is holomorphic in the origin. This shows that ρ and σ commute so that interconvertibility follows from Lemma 18.

Proof. That $Q_\alpha(\rho, \sigma)$ indeed extends to a meromorphic function is seen from Eq. (40). Also note that ρ and σ commute if and only if $q_i = \delta_{ij}$ for some j if and only if $Q_\alpha(\rho, \sigma)$ is proportional to an exponential function. The limits of $Q_\alpha(\rho, \sigma)$ as $\alpha \rightarrow 0^\pm$ are

$$\lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 0^\pm} \left(\sum \frac{p_i}{q_i} q_i^{1/\alpha} \right)^\alpha = q_\pm \lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 0^\pm} \left(\sum \frac{p_i}{q_i} \left(\frac{q_i}{q_\pm} \right)^{1/\alpha} \right)^\alpha = q_\pm, \quad (56)$$

where q_+ is the largest and q_- is the smallest number among the q_i . Therefore, $Q_\alpha(\rho, \sigma)$ has an essential singularity at the origin if $q_+ > q_-$ which is equivalent to non-commutativity of ρ and σ . In the commuting case $Q_\alpha(\rho, \sigma)$ is an entire function and has no singularity. Therefore, having the essential singularity at the origin is indeed equivalent to commutativity of ρ and σ .

Now let $p \ll q$ be probability distributions on a σ -finite measure space such that $(\frac{dp}{dq})^{\pm 1} \in L^\infty(q)$. We will show that $Q_\alpha(p, q)$ has an analytic extension to all of \mathbb{C} . This holomorphic extension is defined by allowing complex α in the definition $Q_\alpha(p, q) = \int (\frac{dp}{dq})^\alpha dq$. These integrals exist in L^1 for all complex $\alpha = \pm a + ib$, $a > 0$, $b \in \mathbb{R}$, because $\int |(\frac{dp}{dq})^\alpha| dq = \int |\frac{dp}{dq}|^{\pm a} dq \leq \|(\frac{dp}{dq})^{\pm 1}\|_{L^\infty(q)}^a < \infty$. \square

3.3 Complete monotonicity

A non-constant smooth function $f : (0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is called *completely monotone*, if

$$(-1)^\alpha \frac{d^n}{d\alpha^n} f(\alpha) > 0, \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}, \alpha \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (57)$$

Bernsteins theorem [47] states that completely monotone functions are precisely the Laplace transforms of positive Borel measures μ on $[0, \infty)$, i.e.,

$$f(\alpha) = \int_0^\infty e^{-t\alpha} d\mu(t), \quad \alpha > 0. \quad (58)$$

One has $\lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 0^+} f(\alpha) = \mu(0)$ and this limit exists in $(0, \infty]$. Note that multiplying f by an exponential corresponds to a shift of the measure μ : $f(\alpha)e^{s\alpha} = \int_0^\infty e^{-(t-s)\alpha} d\mu(t) = \int_0^\infty e^{-t\alpha} d\mu(t+s)$.

For probability distributions $p \ll q$ on a σ -finite measure space (X, μ) the argument used to proof the classical case constructs a probability measure \tilde{q} on $(-\infty, \infty]$ so that the two-sided Laplace transform of \tilde{q} is $Q_\alpha(p, q)$. The support of this measure \tilde{q} is contained in $[-D_\infty(p, q), \infty]$. If now $D_\infty(p, q) = \log \|\frac{dp}{dq}\|_{L^\infty(q)}$ is finite, then we can multiply $Q_\alpha(p, q)$ by $e^{\alpha D_\infty(p, q)}$ to obtain a completely monotone function. With this idea we obtain:

Proposition 25. *Let $\rho \ll \sigma$ be quantum states and let \mathbb{D}_α be a family of quantum Rényi divergences with $\lim_{\alpha \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{D}_\alpha(\rho, \sigma) = D_\infty(\rho, \sigma) < \infty$. Then there are classical probability distributions $p \ll q$ on a σ -finite measure space such that $\mathbb{D}_\alpha(\rho, \sigma) = D_\alpha(p, q)$ if and only if the function*

$$f(\alpha) = e^{(\alpha-1)(\mathbb{D}_\alpha(\rho, \sigma) - D_\infty(\rho, \sigma))} \quad (59)$$

is completely monotone.

Proof. The only if part of the proof was explained in the text before the proposition. The assumption implies that the function $g(\alpha) = e^{-D_\infty(\rho, \sigma)} f(\alpha)$ is also completely monotone. Let μ be the measure defined by the function g through Eq. (58). Define a probability measures q and p on $[-D_\infty(\rho, \sigma), \infty]$ by $q(t) = \mu(t + D_\infty(\rho, \sigma)) + (1 - \mu((-\infty, \infty)))\delta_\infty(t)$ and $dp(t) = e^{-t}dq(t)$. The latter is normalized since

$$p([-D_\infty(\rho, \sigma), \infty]) = (1 - \mu((-\infty, \infty))) + \int_{-D_\infty(\rho, \sigma)}^\infty e^{-t}dq(t) = 1.$$

We set $\mathbb{Q}_\alpha(\rho, \sigma) = e^{(\alpha-1)\mathbb{D}_\alpha(\rho, \sigma)}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} Q_\alpha(p, q) &= \int_{-D_\infty(\rho, \sigma)}^\infty e^{-\alpha t} dq(t) = e^{\alpha D_\infty(\rho, \sigma)} \int_0^\infty e^{-\alpha t} d\mu(t) \\ &= e^{\alpha D_\infty(\rho, \sigma)} g(\alpha) = e^{(1-\alpha)\mathbb{D}_\alpha(\rho, \sigma)} = \mathbb{Q}_\alpha(\rho, \sigma). \end{aligned}$$

□

We apply Proposition 25 to show that if our conjecture is true, there are infinitely many inequalities on the minimal quantum Rényi divergence which separate the quantum and classical case. Furthermore, we give an alternative prove of our claim that the maximal quantum Rényi divergence is not complete. We start with the latter:

If $\rho = |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$ is pure and σ be arbitrary with $\psi \in \text{supp}(\sigma)$. Then

$$e^{(\alpha-1)D_\alpha^{\max}(\rho, \sigma)} = \text{tr}[\sigma(\sigma^{-1/2}\rho\sigma^{-1/2})^\alpha] = \|\sigma^{-1/2}\psi\|^{2(\alpha-1)}.$$

That this is exponential in α implies that the appropriately translated version of Q_α is completely monotone so that classical distributions with the same Rényi divergences exist. Just as in the other proof, this contradicts interconvertibility Proposition 6 whenever ρ and σ do not commute.

We now turn to the inequalities separating commutativity and non-commutativity. If a family \mathbb{D}_α of Rényi divergences is sufficient, it holds for a dichotomy (ρ, σ) with $\rho \ll \sigma$ and $\mathbb{D}_\infty(\rho, \sigma) < \infty$ that

$$[\rho, \sigma] = 0 \iff (-1)^n \frac{d^n}{d\alpha^n} \left(e^{(\alpha-1)(\mathbb{D}_\alpha(\rho, \sigma) - D_\infty(\rho, \sigma))} \right) \geq 0 \quad \forall \alpha > 0, n \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (60)$$

Notice also that each of the functions $(-1)^n \frac{d^n}{d\alpha^n}(\dots)$ is completely monotone in α . Evaluating (60) for $n = 1$, we find

$$(\alpha - 1)\partial_\alpha \mathbb{D}_\alpha(\rho, \sigma) < \mathbb{D}_\infty(\rho, \sigma) - \mathbb{D}_\alpha(\rho, \sigma). \quad (61)$$

Many more point-wise inequalities are known for completely monotone functions [47–49]. For example, suppose that $\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{m} \in \mathbb{N}^L$ are two non-increasingly ordered vectors ($n_1 \geq n_2 \geq \dots$) such that $\mathbf{n} \succ \mathbf{m}$, i.e., $\sum_{j=1}^k n_j \geq \sum_{j=1}^k m_j$ for all $k = 1, \dots, L-1$ and $\sum_{j=1}^L n_j = \sum_{j=1}^L m_j$. Then [48]

$$\prod_{j=1}^L (-1)^{n_j} f^{(n_j)}(x) \geq \prod_{j=1}^L (-1)^{m_j} f^{(m_j)}(x) \quad (62)$$

for any completely monotone function f . In other words, the function

$$\mathbf{n} \mapsto \prod_{j=1}^L (-1)^{n_j} f^{(n_j)}(x) \quad (63)$$

is Schur-convex. For $L = 2$ this yields log-convexity of completely monotone functions. Exploring the resulting inequalities for Rényi divergences seems like an interesting open problem.

As discussed above, if Conjecture 16 is true, then the function

$$g(\alpha|\rho, \sigma) := e^{-\alpha D_\infty(\rho, \sigma)} e^{(\alpha-1) D_\alpha^{\min}(\rho, \sigma)} = e^{-\alpha D_\infty(\rho, \sigma)} Q_\alpha^{\min}(\rho, \sigma) \quad (64)$$

is completely monotone if and only if $[\rho, \sigma] = 0$. This allows us to obtain additional evidence in favor of the conjecture by numerical means. Specifically, we can compute $g(\alpha|\rho, \sigma)$ and its derivatives for a choice of (ρ, σ) numerically and see whether (60) holds true. We have checked this for numerous examples, without finding a counter-example to our conjecture. A numerical example for qubits is presented in Fig. 1.

3.4 Quantum f -divergences

Following [23] this section is concerned with the notions of *standard* and *maximal* quantum f -divergences. [23] treats the topic in the setting of general von Neumann algebras. For an account of the development of the notions see there and the references therein. Here, we are only concerned with classical and quantum states in the sense of the previous sections and will summarize the theory only for these cases. The Petz quantum Rényi divergences are examples for *standard* quantum f -divergences, while the maximal Rényi divergences can be obtained through *maximal* quantum f -divergences (see below). We will show that neither of the two families of quantum divergences is sufficient in the sense introduced above by demonstrating (well-known) constructions of classical dichotomies with equal divergences as an arbitrary but fixed (quantum) dichotomy. By Corollary 9 interconvertibility cannot hold in general and the claimed result follows. We thus see, in particular, that neither Petz nor maximal Rényi divergences are sufficient.

Let $f : (0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a convex function. The (classical) f -divergence of two probability distributions $p \ll q$ is

$$Q_f(p, q) = \int_X f\left(\frac{dp}{dq}\right) dq \in (-\infty, \infty].$$




Figure 1: The derivatives $(-1)^k \partial_\alpha^k g(\alpha|\rho_s, \sigma)$ for $\mathbb{D}_\alpha = D_\alpha^{\min}$ in the case $\rho_s = e^{s\sigma_x}/2 \cosh(s)$, $\sigma = e^{\sigma_z}/\cosh(1)$ and for various values of s (see Eq. (64) for the definition of $g(\alpha|\rho, \sigma)$). If $g(\alpha|\rho_s, \sigma)$ was completely monotone, all curves would have to be monotonically decreasing and convex. Note that $[\rho_s, \sigma] = 0$ if and only if $s = 0$. For $s = 0$ the function is completely monotone. As s increases, the commutator-norm $\|[\rho_s, \sigma]\|$ increases monotonically while lower and lower derivatives signal that the function is not completely monotone. Already for $s = 0.3$ one can see that the second derivative is not completely monotone.

We assume f to be convex to ensure that the DPI holds for classical channels as well as to guarantee good behaviour towards 0 and ∞ , see [23], but the definition in principle makes sense also for non-convex functions. To define the quantum generalizations mentioned above, let $\rho = \sum_i p_i |\psi_i\rangle\langle\psi_i|$ be a density operator. We denote its purification by $|\rho\rangle = \sum_i \sqrt{p_i} \psi_i \otimes \bar{\psi}_i$ in the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H} \otimes \bar{\mathcal{H}}$. Here, $\bar{\mathcal{H}}$ denotes the conjugate Hilbert space of \mathcal{H} . We can identify linear operators A on \mathcal{H} with linear operators \bar{A} on $\bar{\mathcal{H}}$. Alternatively, we can identify $|\rho\rangle \equiv \sqrt{\rho}$ in the Hilbert space of Hilbert-Schmidt operators on \mathcal{H} (and we will mainly employ this picture).

We start with the notion of standard quantum f -divergences, see [23, Sec. 2]. Let σ be another density operator with $\text{supp}(\rho) \subseteq \text{supp}(\sigma)$. The *relative modular operator* $\Delta_{\rho, \sigma}$ acts on a Hilbert-Schmidt operator A by

$$\Delta_{\rho, \sigma} A = \rho A \sigma^{-1}$$

where σ^{-1} again denotes the pseudo-inverse of σ . On $\mathcal{H} \otimes \bar{\mathcal{H}}$ we identify $\Delta_{\rho, \sigma} \equiv \rho \otimes \bar{\sigma}^{-1}$. $\Delta_{\rho, \sigma}$ is a self-adjoint operator which is unbounded if \mathcal{H} is infinite dimensional. For $f : (0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ convex, we define the *standard quantum f -divergence* of ρ and σ to be

$$Q_f^{\text{std}}(\rho, \sigma) = \langle \sigma | f(\Delta_{\rho, \sigma}) | \sigma \rangle = \text{tr}[\sqrt{\sigma} f(\Delta_{\rho, \sigma}) (\sqrt{\sigma})] \in (-\infty, \infty].$$

It is unitarily invariant and if f is operator convex then Q_f^{std} satisfies the DPI. For $g(t) = t \log(t)$ we obtain the Umegaki relative entropy

$$Q_g^{\text{std}}(\rho, \sigma) = D(\rho, \sigma) = \text{tr}[\rho \log(\rho) - \rho \log(\sigma)].$$

Considering the family $f_\alpha : x \mapsto x^\alpha$ we recover [23, Sec. 3.1] the Petz quantum Rényi divergence as

$$D_\alpha^P(\rho, \sigma) = \frac{1}{\alpha-1} \log Q_{f_\alpha}^{\text{std}}(\rho, \sigma).$$

f_α is operator convex for $\alpha \in [1, 2]$ and operator concave for $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ [50]. Therefore, $Q_{f_\alpha}^{\text{std}}$ satisfies the DPI on $[1, 2]$ while $-Q_{f_\alpha}^{\text{std}}$ satisfies it on $[0, 1]$. By monotonicity of log and due to $\alpha - 1$ being positive on $(1, 2]$ and negative on $[0, 1)$ we find that D_α^P satisfies the DPI on $[0, 2]$.

To construct the classical dichotomies let $\rho = \sum_i p_i R_i$ and $\sigma = \sum_j q_j S_j$ be the spectral decompositions of ρ and σ . Then $f(\Delta_{\rho, \sigma})(A) = \sum_{i,j} f(p_i q_j^{-1}) R_i A S_j$, so

$$Q_f^{\text{std}}(\rho, \sigma) = \sum_{i,j} q_j f(p_i q_j^{-1}) \text{tr}[R_i S_j].$$

Setting $P_{ij} = p_i \text{tr}[R_i S_j]$ and $Q_{ij} = q_j \text{tr}[R_i S_j]$ yields classical states with the same f -divergences as ρ and σ (for all f). P and Q are known as the *Nussbaum-Skoła distributions* [40].

We now turn towards the *maximal quantum f -divergences*, see [23, Sec. 4]. With ρ and σ as above and $T_{\rho, \sigma} = \sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}} \rho \sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}} \geq 0$ (possibly unbounded) they are given by the formula

$$Q_f^{\text{max}}(\rho, \sigma) = \text{tr}[\sigma f(T_{\rho, \sigma})] \in (-\infty, \infty].$$

It is again unitarily invariant and satisfies the data processing inequality provided that f is operator convex. The maximal quantum Rényi divergence is obtained from this as

$$D_\alpha^{\text{max}}(\rho, \sigma) = \frac{1}{\alpha-1} \log Q_{f_\alpha}^{\text{max}}(\rho, \sigma).$$

As above for D_α^P we find that D_α^{max} satisfies the DPI on $[0, 2]$. It can be computed as

$$Q_f^{\text{max}}(\rho, \sigma) = \min_{C, (p, q), T} Q_f(p, q)$$

where the minimum ranges over all (possibly continuous) classical systems C , dichotomies with $p, q \in \mathfrak{S}(C)$ and channels $T : \mathfrak{S}(C) \rightarrow \mathfrak{S}(S)$ that map (p, q) into (ρ, σ) . To show that the minimum is indeed attained, set $\omega = \rho + \sigma$ and let $T_{\rho, \omega} = \int_{[0,1]} t dP_{\rho, \omega}(t)$. Note that although $T_{\rho, \sigma}$ can be unbounded in general, $T_{\rho, \omega}$ is always bounded with $0 \leq T_{\rho, \omega} \leq \mathbf{1}$. This follows since $S_\omega - T_{\rho, \omega} = T_{\sigma, \omega} \geq 0$ with S_ω denoting the projection onto $\text{supp}(\omega) = \text{supp}(\sigma)$. In particular, the spectral measure of $T_{\rho, \omega}$ is indeed supported on $[0, 1]$. We can now define a finite Borel measure ν on $[0, 1]$ by setting

$$\mu(A) = \text{tr}[\omega P_{\rho, \omega}(A)] = \text{tr}[E_{\rho, \omega}(A)]$$

where $E_{\rho, \omega}(A) := \sqrt{\omega} P_{\rho, \omega}(A) \sqrt{\omega}$. We then define a channel $T : L^1(X, \mu) \rightarrow \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{H})$ by setting

$$T(g) = \int g dE_{\rho, \omega}.$$

Let $p(t) = t$ and $q(t) = 1 - t$ which are indeed probability densities relative to μ . It then holds that $T(\mathbf{1}) = \omega$, $T(p) = \rho$ and $T(q) = \omega - \rho = \sigma$. Furthermore, for every operator convex function f it holds that $Q_f^{\text{max}}(\rho, \sigma) = Q_f(p, q)$ [23]. Apart from operator convexity, nothing in this construction depends on the f used to define the quantum f -divergence. This proves existence of a single pair of classical distributions with the same (maximal) f -divergences as ρ and σ .

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank Milan Mosonyi, Robert Salzmann, Alexander Stottmeister, Reinhard F. Werner and Andreas Winter for interesting and helpful discussions. N.G. acknowledges financial support by the MICIIN with funding from European Union NextGenerationEU (PRTR-C17.I1) and by the Generalitat de Catalunya. H.W. acknowledges support by the DFG through SFB 1227 (DQ-mat), Quantum Valley Lower Saxony, and funding by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation) under Germanys Excellence Strategy EXC-2123 QuantumFrontiers 390837967.

A Interconvertibility from Rényi Divergences without absolute continuity

In the main text we only considered classical dichotomies with $p \ll q$. In this appendix, we generalize Theorem 1 to arbitrary pairs of probability measures. To do this, we first have to find a way to define Rényi divergences for such measures. We appeal to the Lebesgue decomposition theorem stating that if p and q are probability measures on a measure space, then there is a unique decomposition

$$p = \lambda p^{\parallel} + (1 - \lambda) p^{\perp}, \quad p^{\parallel} \ll q, \quad p^{\perp} \perp q, \quad \lambda \in [0, 1] \quad (65)$$

with p^{\parallel} and p^{\perp} probability measures as well. Now, for $\alpha \in (0, 1) \cup (1, \infty)$ define [23]

$$D_{\alpha}(p, q) := \begin{cases} \frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1} \log(\lambda) + D_{\alpha}(p^{\parallel}, q), & \text{if } \alpha \in (0, 1) \\ D_{\alpha}(p, q), & \text{if } p \ll q, \alpha > 1, \\ \infty & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (66)$$

This reduces to the usual definition for $p = p^{\parallel} \ll q$. Moreover, note that for $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ we have $D_{\alpha}(p, q) = 0$ precisely if $\lambda = 1$ and hence $p = p^{\parallel}$. It thus follows that $p = q$. Our main result now generalizes as follows:

Theorem 26. *Let (X_i, μ_i) , $i = 1, 2$, be measured spaces and p_i, q_i probability measures in $L^1(X_i, \mu_i)$ such that p_i is not orthogonal to q_i . If there is an open interval $(a, b) \subset \mathbb{R}$ such that*

$$D_{\alpha}(p_1, q_1) = D_{\alpha}(p_2, q_2) < \infty \quad \forall \alpha \in (a, b), \quad (67)$$

there are stochastic maps between $L^1(X_1, \mu_1)$ and $L^1(X_2, \mu_2)$ interconverting the dichotomies (p_1, q_1) and (p_2, q_2) .

Some remarks are in order: First, if $p_1 \perp q_1$ and $p_2 \perp q_2$ the two dichotomies are trivially interconvertible. Therefore we don't lose much by excluding this case (one could incorporate it by considering Q_{α} instead of D_{α}).

Second, let us comment on the role of the interval (a, b) : Suppose that p_i is not absolutely continuous with respect to q_i . Then the conditions of the Theorem require $0 \leq a < b \leq 1$, because otherwise the Rényi divergence is infinite by definition. Conversely, if $p_i \ll q_i$ and $b > 1$, then we already know from Theorem 1 that the Rényi divergences must match for all $0 < \alpha < b$, since the two dichotomies are interconvertible and the Rényi-divergences are non-decreasing in α . Thus we can in fact always assume $(a, b) \subseteq (0, 1)$.

Proof sketch. We only need to discuss the case $\lambda < 1$. We thus get as input $D_\alpha(\lambda_1 p_1^\parallel, q_1) = D_\alpha(\lambda_2 p_2^\parallel, q_2)$. One can now check that the proof of Theorem 1 also applies to subnormalized measures p_i , which then implies $(\lambda_1 p_1^\parallel, q_1) \leftrightarrow (\lambda_2 p_2^\parallel, q_2)$ (in particular $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2 =: \lambda$). The result then follows from Lemma 27 below. \square

Lemma 27. *Let (X_i, μ_i) , $i = 1, 2$, be σ -finite measure spaces and let $p_i^\parallel, p_i^\perp, q_i \in L^1(X_i, \mu_i)$ be probability measures such that $p_i^\parallel \ll q_i$ and $p_i^\perp \perp q_i$. Suppose $(p_1^\parallel, q_1) \leftrightarrow (p_2^\parallel, q_2)$. Then for any $\lambda \in [0, 1]$ we also have*

$$(\lambda p_1^\parallel + (1 - \lambda) p_1^\perp, q_1) \leftrightarrow (\lambda p_2^\parallel + (1 - \lambda) p_2^\perp, q_2) \quad (68)$$

Proof. If $r \in L^1(X_1, \mu_1)$, we define r_s and r_c to be the singular and absolutely continuous parts of r with respect to q_1 . Note that $r \mapsto r_s$ and $r \mapsto r_c$ are linear substochastic maps and that $r = r_s + r_c$. We have $(p_1)_c = \lambda p_1^\parallel$, $(p_1)_s = (1 - \lambda) p_1^\perp$, $(q_1)_s = 0$ and $(q_1)_c = q_1$. Set $p_i = \lambda p_i^\parallel + (1 - \lambda) p_i^\perp$. Let T_1 be a stochastic map taking (p_1^\parallel, q_1) to (p_2^\parallel, q_2) . Define

$$S_1(r) = r_s(X_1) p_2^\perp + T_1(r_c).$$

Indeed, $S_1(p_1) = (1 - \lambda) p_2^\perp + T_1(\lambda p_1^\parallel) = (1 - \lambda) p_2^\perp + \lambda p_2^\parallel = p_2$ and $S_1(q_1) = T_1(q_1) = q_2$. Constructing S_2 mapping in the other direction analogously proves the claim. \square

We proved Theorem 26 by reducing it to Theorem 1. Alternatively we can adapt the proof of Theorem 1 so that it does not require absolute continuity to begin with. We sketch this here:

Direct proof of Theorem 26. Let (p, q) be a dichotomy on a σ -finite measure space (X, μ) . Let $p = p_c + p_s$ be the Lebesgue decomposition with respect to q . First, note that we may choose $\mu = p_s + q$ without loss of generality. Set $\mathbb{R} = \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty, -\infty\}$. We start with an arbitrary dichotomy of probability measures on $L^1(X, \mu)$ and define a measurable function

$$f(x) = \infty \cdot \chi_{\text{supp}(q) \setminus \text{supp}(p)}(x) - \log\left(\frac{dp}{dq}(x)\right) \chi_{\text{supp}(q)}(x) - \infty \cdot \chi_{\text{supp}(p_s)}(x). \quad (69)$$

This is just $f = -\log(\frac{dp}{dq})$ if we interpret $\frac{dp}{dq}$ as infinite on $\text{supp}(p) \setminus \text{supp}(q)$ (and as zero on $\text{supp}(q) \setminus \text{supp}(p)$ as usual). We again consider the push-forward measure $\tilde{\mu} := f_*(\mu)$ and $(\tilde{p}, \tilde{q}) = (f_*(p), f_*(q))$ which is a dichotomy in $L^1(\mathbb{R}, \tilde{\mu})$. For measures $r \ll \tilde{\mu}$ we denote by r_s (resp. r_c) the singular (resp. absolutely) part with respect to \tilde{q} . With this we have $\tilde{\mu} = \tilde{p}_s + \tilde{q}$ and it holds that

$$\tilde{p}(\{\infty\}) = \tilde{q}(\{-\infty\}) = 0, \quad \tilde{p}(\{-\infty\}) = p_s(X), \quad \tilde{q}(\{\infty\}) = q(X \setminus \text{supp}(p)). \quad (70)$$

Just as in Eq. (30), one sees that

$$\frac{d\tilde{p}_c}{d\tilde{q}}(t) = e^{-t} \chi_{(-\infty, \infty]}(t). \quad (71)$$

We now define stochastic maps $f_* : L^1(X, \mu) \rightarrow L^1(\mathbb{R}, \tilde{\mu})$ and $R : L^1(\mathbb{R}, \tilde{\mu}) \rightarrow L^1(X, \mu)$. The map f_* is the push-forward with f and R is given by

$$R(g \cdot \tilde{\mu}) = (g \circ f) \mu = g(-\infty) p_s + (g \circ f) \cdot q. \quad (72)$$

This map is positive, preserves normalization and indeed satisfies $R(\tilde{q}) = R(\chi_{(-\infty, \infty]} \cdot \tilde{\mu}) = (\chi_{(-\infty, \infty]} \circ f) \cdot q = q$ and $R(\tilde{p}) = R((\chi_{\{-\infty\}} + \frac{d\tilde{p}_c}{d\tilde{q}})\tilde{\mu}) = p_s + e^{-f} \cdot q = p_s + p_c = p$. With the definition Eq. (66) we have

$$D_\alpha(p, q) = D_\alpha(\tilde{p}, \tilde{q}) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-t\alpha} d\tilde{q}(t), \quad \alpha \in (0, 1). \quad (73)$$

If we had two dichotomies (p_i, q_i) with equal Renyi divergences then this implies that the two-sided Laplace transforms of \tilde{q}_1 and \tilde{q}_2 are equal. By injectivity of the Laplace transform (see Lemma 15), it follows that $\tilde{q}_1 = \tilde{q}_2$ and hence that $(\tilde{p}_1)_c = e^{-t}\tilde{q}_1 = e^{-t}\tilde{q}_2 = (\tilde{p}_2)_c$. Furthermore, $(p_1)_s(X_1) = 1 - (\tilde{p}_1)_c(\mathbb{R}) = 1 - (\tilde{p}_2)_c(\mathbb{R}) = (p_2)_s(X_2)$. Therefore, we also have $\tilde{p}_1 = (\tilde{p}_1)_c + (\tilde{p}_1)_s = (\tilde{p}_1)_c + (p_1)_s(X_1)\delta_{-\infty} = (\tilde{p}_2)_c + (p_2)_s(X_2)\delta_{-\infty} = \tilde{p}_2$. With this we also get $\tilde{\mu}_1 = \tilde{\mu}_2$ which proves interconvertibility because

$$(p_1, q_1) \leftrightarrow (\tilde{p}_1, \tilde{q}_1) = (\tilde{p}_2, \tilde{q}_2) \leftrightarrow (p_2, q_2).$$

□

B Convertibility and interconvertibility for probability vectors

Here we discuss the Koashi-Imoto minimal form and solution to the classical case (see Theorem 1) for pairs of probability vectors, where everything can be constructed explicitly.

Minimal form. Let $\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be probability vectors. Without loss of generality we assume that $\mathbf{p} + \mathbf{q}$ has no zero entry and let l be the number of zero entries of \mathbf{q} . If necessary, apply a permutation to \mathbf{p} and \mathbf{q} , so that

$$\mathbf{r} = \left(\frac{p_1}{q_1}, \frac{p_2}{q_2}, \dots, \frac{p_n}{q_n} \right) \quad (74)$$

is ordered such that $r_1 \geq r_2 \geq \dots \geq r_n$. If $l > 0$, $r_1 = \dots = r_l = \infty$. Denote by m the number of *distinct* entries of the vector \mathbf{r} . For example, if $\mathbf{p} = (\frac{1}{12}, \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{12}, \frac{1}{12}, 0)$ and $\mathbf{q} = (0, \frac{1}{12}, \frac{1}{12}, \frac{1}{6}, \frac{1}{6}, \frac{1}{2})$, then $\mathbf{r} = (\infty, 6, 3, \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, 0)$ and $m = 5$. Each entry of \mathbf{r} appears with a certain multiplicity which we denote by d_1, \dots, d_m and we collect the corresponding indices in a set I_j with size $d_j = |I_j|$ (in the above example this means $d_1 = d_2 = d_3 = 1, d_4 = 2, d_5 = 1$ and $I_1 = \{1\}, I_2 = \{2\}, I_3 = \{3\}, I_4 = \{4, 5\}, I_5 = \{6\}$). The minimal form is given by the probability vectors $\tilde{\mathbf{p}}$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}$ on \mathbb{R}^m with entries

$$\tilde{p}_j = \sum_{k \in I_j} p_k, \quad \tilde{q}_j = \sum_{k \in I_j} q_k. \quad (75)$$

Let us define $s(j) := \sum_{k=1}^{j-1} d_k$ and the vectors $\mathbf{w}^{(j)} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_j}$ with

$$w_k^{(1)} = \frac{p_k}{\tilde{p}_1}, \quad w_k^{(j)} = \frac{q_{s(j)+k}}{\tilde{q}_j}, \quad j = 2, \dots, m. \quad (76)$$

Note that $\frac{p_j}{q_j} = \frac{\tilde{p}_k}{\tilde{q}_k}$ for all k and $j \in I_k$ as long as $0 \neq \tilde{q}_k, \tilde{p}_k$. The dichotomy (\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}) can be interconverted with its minimal form $(\tilde{\mathbf{p}}, \tilde{\mathbf{q}})$ using the stochastic matrices $T \in M_{m \times n}(\mathbb{R})$

and $R \in M_{n \times m}(\mathbb{R})$ given by

$$T = \begin{pmatrix} \underbrace{1 \cdots 1}_{d_1} & & & \\ & \underbrace{1 \cdots 1}_{d_2} & & \\ & & \ddots & \\ & & & \underbrace{1 \cdots 1}_{d_m} \end{pmatrix}, \quad R = \begin{pmatrix} w_1^{(1)} & & & \\ \vdots & & & \\ w_{d_1}^{(1)} & \cdots & & \\ & & w_1^{(m)} & \\ & & \vdots & \\ & & w_{d_m}^{(m)} & \end{pmatrix}. \quad (77)$$

Both matrices T and R have a block form. In case of T these blocks have dimension $1 \times d_i$ and for R they have dimension $d_i \times 1$. Note that R could be written as $R = \text{diag}(\mathbf{w}^{(1)}, \dots, \mathbf{w}^{(m)})$ with some abuse of notation. We will now show that $(\tilde{\mathbf{p}}, \tilde{\mathbf{q}})$ are the Koashi-Imoto minimal form of (\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}) . We may decompose \mathbb{R}^n and the probability vectors \mathbf{p} and \mathbf{q} as

$$\mathbb{R}^n = \bigoplus_{j=1}^m \mathbb{R}^{d_j}, \quad \mathbf{p} = \bigoplus_{j=1}^m \tilde{p}_j \mathbf{w}_j, \quad \mathbf{q} = \bigoplus_{j=1}^m \tilde{q}_j \mathbf{w}_j. \quad (78)$$

This is precisely classical version of the Koashi-Imoto decomposition for the dichotomy (\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}) . We see that the \mathcal{J}_j spaces are all trivial (anything else would imply a form of non-commutativity) and that the \mathcal{K}_j spaces are given by \mathbb{R}^{d_j} with the role of the states ω_j taken by the vectors \mathbf{w}_j . If we “trace out” the \mathbf{w}_j ’s then we obtain the vectors $\tilde{\mathbf{p}}$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}$. That this decomposition is, in fact, the minimal one follows from the proof of Corollary 14. The stochastic matrix T effectively implements the push-forward map f_* with $f = -\log(\frac{dp}{dq})$ while R implements the associated recovery map. We will also explicitly see the minimality below.

Interconvertibility. Let $(\mathbf{p}_1, \mathbf{q}_1), (\mathbf{p}_2, \mathbf{q}_2)$ be classical dichotomies. Without loss of generality we again assume the ordering as above. Denote the minimal forms by $(\tilde{\mathbf{p}}_i, \tilde{\mathbf{q}}_i)$ and the stochastic matrices interconverting them with $(\mathbf{p}_i, \mathbf{q}_i)$ by T_i and R_i (as in Eq. (77)). In this case the interconvertibility, if possible, can always be achieved using the maps $R_1 T_2$ and $R_2 T_1$. Collecting our results we get:

Corollary 28. *The following are equivalent*

- (1) $(\mathbf{p}_1, \mathbf{q}_1)$ and $(\mathbf{p}_2, \mathbf{q}_2)$ are interconvertible,
- (2) $D_\alpha(\mathbf{p}_1, \mathbf{q}_1) = D_\alpha(\mathbf{p}_2, \mathbf{q}_2)$ for all α in an open interval $(a, b) \subset (0, \infty)$ (with $(a, b) \subseteq (0, 1)$ if $\mathbf{p}_i \ll \mathbf{q}_i$ does not hold.),
- (3) $(\tilde{\mathbf{p}}_1, \tilde{\mathbf{q}}_1) = (\tilde{\mathbf{p}}_2, \tilde{\mathbf{q}}_2)$,
- (4) $R_1 T_2(\mathbf{p}_2, \mathbf{q}_2) = (\mathbf{p}_1, \mathbf{q}_1)$ and $(\mathbf{p}_2, \mathbf{q}_2) = R_2 T_1(\mathbf{p}_1, \mathbf{q}_1)$.

In the case of finite-dimensional probability vectors the equivalence of (2) and (3) can be seen explicitly as follows. We treat the general case where $\mathbf{p} \ll \mathbf{q}$ does not hold. Since r_k is constant for $k \in I_j$ we find (assuming $\tilde{q}_1 = 0$ and setting $\lambda = \sum_{j=2}^m \tilde{p}_j = 1 - \tilde{p}_1$, compare wit Eq. (66))

$$\exp[(\alpha - 1)D_\alpha(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q})] = \lambda^\alpha \sum_{j=2}^m \sum_{k \in I_j} q_k r_k^\alpha = \lambda^\alpha \sum_{j=2}^m \tilde{q}_j \tilde{r}_j^\alpha = \exp[(\alpha - 1)D_\alpha(\tilde{\mathbf{p}}, \tilde{\mathbf{q}})] \quad (79)$$




Figure 2: Koashi-Imoto minimal form from the point of view of Lorenz curves: The blue curve on the left corresponds to $L_{(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q})}$. Removing all points from the Lorenz curve that lie in the interior of straight line segments (the blue points) yields the Lorenz curve $L_{(\tilde{\mathbf{p}}, \tilde{\mathbf{q}})}$ on the right. This corresponds to the map T . Obviously, no further “anchoring points” can be removed from the curve without altering it.

with $\tilde{r}_j := \tilde{p}_j / \tilde{q}_j = r_k$ for $k \in I_j$. Therefore $D_\alpha(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}) = D_\alpha(\tilde{\mathbf{p}}, \tilde{\mathbf{q}})$. Since $\tilde{r}_j^\alpha = \exp(\alpha \log(\tilde{r}_j))$ and exponential functions $x \mapsto \exp(ax)$ are linearly independent for distinct a , we find that $D_\alpha(\mathbf{p}_1, \mathbf{q}_1) = D_\alpha(\mathbf{p}_2, \mathbf{q}_2) \quad \forall \alpha \in (a, b)$ implies

$$\tilde{q}_{1,j} = \tilde{q}_{2,j}, \quad \tilde{r}_{1,j} = \tilde{r}_{2,j}, \quad \lambda_1 = \lambda_2, \quad j = 2, \dots, m \quad (80)$$

where we used $\lambda_i = \sum_{j=2}^m \tilde{p}_{i,j} = \sum_{j=2}^m \tilde{r}_{i,j} \tilde{q}_j$. Hence, we can reconstruct $\tilde{p}_{1,j} = \tilde{p}_{2,j}$ for $j = 1, \dots, m$. We thus find

$$D_\alpha(\mathbf{p}_1, \mathbf{q}_1) = D_\alpha(\mathbf{p}_2, \mathbf{q}_2) \quad \forall \alpha \in (a, b) \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad (\tilde{\mathbf{p}}_1, \tilde{\mathbf{q}}_1) = (\tilde{\mathbf{p}}_2, \tilde{\mathbf{q}}_2). \quad (81)$$

Lorenz curves. It is useful to visualize the Koashi-Imoto decomposition for probability vectors. Given a dichotomy (\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}) of n -dimensional probability vectors (again ordered according to the ratios r_j), consider the piece-wise linear function $x \mapsto L_{(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q})}(x)$ whose graph is given by linearly joining the $n + 1$ points

$$(x_j, y_j) = \left(\sum_{k=1}^j q_k, \sum_{k=1}^j p_k \right), \quad j = 1, \dots, n, \quad (x_0, y_0) = 0. \quad (82)$$

(The graph of) $L_{(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q})}$ is called a *Lorenz curve*. Its slope between x_j and x_{j+1} is given precisely by r_j . Since $r_j \geq r_{j+1}$ the curve is concave, see Fig. 2 for an example. It is known that [9, 11, 15, 51]

$$(\mathbf{p}_1, \mathbf{q}_1) \rightarrow (\mathbf{p}_2, \mathbf{q}_2) \Leftrightarrow L_{(\mathbf{p}_1, \mathbf{q}_1)}(x) \geq L_{(\mathbf{p}_2, \mathbf{q}_2)}(x) \quad \forall x \in [0, 1]. \quad (83)$$

If a Lorenz curve $L_{(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q})}$ contains several consecutive linear segments with identical slope (corresponding to identical values of r_j), it is clear that the same curve can be obtained from a lower-dimensional vector, where the corresponding entries in \mathbf{p} and \mathbf{q} are simply

summed up. Doing this for all consecutive linear segments with identical slopes precisely corresponds to the map T above and yields $(\tilde{\mathbf{p}}, \tilde{\mathbf{q}})$. From this picture it is also clear that the resulting dichotomy is minimal, see Fig. 2 for an illustration.

Convertibility from Rényi divergences for $\alpha > 0$ alone. If $(\mathbf{p}_1, \mathbf{q}_1) \rightarrow (\mathbf{p}_2, \mathbf{q}_2)$ then $D_\alpha(\mathbf{p}_1, \mathbf{q}_1) \geq D_\alpha(\mathbf{p}_2, \mathbf{q}_2)$ due to the data-processing inequality. Interestingly, the converse is not true: $D_\alpha(\mathbf{p}_1, \mathbf{q}_1) \geq D_\alpha(\mathbf{p}_2, \mathbf{q}_2)$ does in general not imply $(\mathbf{p}_1, \mathbf{q}_1) \rightarrow (\mathbf{p}_2, \mathbf{q}_2)$ [25]. Still, we will now show that the knowledge of $D_\alpha(\mathbf{p}_1, \mathbf{q}_1)$ and $D_\alpha(\mathbf{p}_2, \mathbf{q}_2)$ for $\alpha \in (a, b)$ is sufficient to decide whether $(\mathbf{p}_1, \mathbf{q}_1) \rightarrow (\mathbf{p}_2, \mathbf{q}_2)$.

Proposition 29. *There is an algorithm to determine if a given dichotomy $(\mathbf{p}_1, \mathbf{q}_1)$ is convertible to a dichotomy $(\mathbf{p}_2, \mathbf{q}_2)$, i.e., if $(\mathbf{p}_1, \mathbf{q}_1) \rightarrow (\mathbf{p}_2, \mathbf{q}_2)$, from the knowledge of the Rényi divergences $D_\alpha(\mathbf{p}_1, \mathbf{q}_1)$ and $D_\alpha(\mathbf{p}_2, \mathbf{q}_2)$ on any open subset $(a, b) \subset [0, \infty)$ on which they are both finite.*

This follows from the following Lemma since knowing the Lorenz curves allows one to decide convertibility (see previous paragraph) and since we can reconstruct the Lorenz curves from $(\tilde{\mathbf{p}}, \tilde{\mathbf{q}})$ algorithmically.

Lemma 30. *There is an algorithm to reconstruct $(\tilde{\mathbf{p}}, \tilde{\mathbf{q}})$ from the knowledge of $D_\alpha(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q})$ over any open subset $(a, b) \subset [0, \infty)$ on which $D_\alpha(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}) < \infty$.*

Proof. We have seen in (79) that (assuming the general case with $\tilde{q}_1 = 0$ and $\lambda = 1 - \tilde{p}_1$)

$$\exp((\alpha - 1)D_\alpha(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q})) = \lambda^\alpha \sum_{j=2}^m \tilde{q}_j \tilde{r}_j^\alpha = \mathcal{L}[t \mapsto \sum_{j=2}^m \tilde{q}_j \delta(t + \log(\lambda \tilde{r}_j))](\alpha), \quad (84)$$

where \mathcal{L} is the (two-sided) Laplace-transform. Since the Laplace-transform is injective on any open interval (see Lemma 15), we can perform an inverse Laplace transform and read off \tilde{q}_j and $\lambda \tilde{r}_j$ for $j = 2, \dots, m$. Since $\sum_{j=2}^m \tilde{r}_j \tilde{q}_j = \sum_{j=2}^m \tilde{p}_j = \lambda$, we obtain

$$\lambda = 1 - \tilde{p}_1 = \sqrt{\sum_{j=2}^m \lambda \tilde{r}_j \tilde{q}_j} \quad (85)$$

and consequently \tilde{p}_j for all j . Thus we have reconstructed $\tilde{\mathbf{p}}$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}$ from the knowledge of the Rényi divergences. \square

C Proof of Theorem 4 for infinite-dimensional systems

The direction (B) \Rightarrow (A) is straightforward. For (A) \Rightarrow (B), consider the Koashi-Iomoto minimal forms $\hat{\rho}_\theta^{(i)}$ acting on $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_i = \bigoplus_j \mathcal{J}_j^{(i)}$. Define the von Neumann algebra $\mathcal{M}_i = \bigoplus_j \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{J}_j^{(i)})$ whose pre-dual $(\mathcal{M}_i)_* = \bigoplus_j \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{J}_j^{(i)})$ contains $\hat{\rho}_\theta^{(i)}$. We have positive trace-preserving maps $\pi_i : \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{H}_{S_i}) \rightarrow (\mathcal{M}_i)_*$, $\iota_i : (\mathcal{M}_i)_* \rightarrow \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{H}_{S_i})$ as in Eq. (12). Let T_1 and T_2 be channels interconverting $\rho_\theta^{(1)}$ and $\rho_\theta^{(2)}$. Then $\hat{T}_1 = \pi_2 T_1 \iota_1$ and $\hat{T}_2 = \pi_1 T_2 \iota_2$ are completely positive trace-preserving maps between $(\mathcal{M}_1)_*$ and $(\mathcal{M}_2)_*$ which interconvert $\hat{\rho}_\theta^{(1)}$ and $\hat{\rho}_\theta^{(2)}$. By the Koashi-Iomoto theorem, it now holds that $\hat{T}_2 \hat{T}_1 = \text{id}$ and $\hat{T}_1 \hat{T}_2 = \text{id}$. Consider the unital completely positive maps $\alpha_i : \mathcal{M}_i \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_j$ dual to \hat{T}_j , $j \neq i$. We then

obtain $\alpha_1\alpha_2 = \text{id}_{\mathcal{M}_2}$ and $\alpha_2\alpha_1 = \text{id}_{\mathcal{M}_1}$. Since the α_i are contractive but their product is isometric, it follows that the α_i are both isometric. From Kadison's theorem on completely positive isometries [52] we obtain that both α_i are $*$ -isomorphisms and that $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2^{-1}$. In particular, $\mathcal{M}_1 \cong \mathcal{M}_2$. Consequently, the block structures are equivalent, i.e., $N_1 = N_2$ and there is a reordering of indices such that the j th block of \mathcal{M}_1 is isomorphic to the j th block of \mathcal{M}_2 . The adjoints of the unitaries implementing α_1 then map $\rho_{j|\theta}^{(1)}$ to $\rho_{j|\theta}^{(2)}$ and we get $P_{j|\theta}^{(1)} = P_{j|\theta}^{(2)}$.

It remains to be shown that interconverting channels are of the form Eq. (14). From the Koashi-Imoto theorem we get that for all interconverting channels R, T there are channels $E_j : \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{K}_j^{(1)}) \rightarrow \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{K}_j^{(2)})$ such that $(R \circ T)|_{\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{J}_j^{(1)} \otimes \mathcal{K}_j^{(1)})} = \text{id}_{\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{J}_j^{(1)})} \otimes E_j$ for all j . We apply this to the specific channel $S = \oplus_j ((U_j(\cdot)U_j^*) \otimes (\omega_j \text{tr}[\cdot]))$ which clearly maps $\rho_\theta^{(1)}$ to $\rho_\theta^{(2)}$. Thus evaluation of $R \circ S$ on states of the form $\sigma = \oplus_j (U_j^* \sigma_j U_j \otimes \omega_j^{(1)})$ shows

$$R(\oplus_j (\sigma_j \otimes \omega_j^{(2)})) = R \circ S(\sigma) = \oplus_j (U_j^* \sigma_j U_j \otimes \omega_j^{(1)}).$$

As this holds for all states σ_j the channel acts as $U_j^*(\cdot)U_j \otimes R_j$ on the j th block. This then gives $R_j(\omega_j^{(2)}) = \omega_j^{(1)}$ as claimed. Applying the analogous argument to T finishes the proof. \square

References

- [1] E. Torgersen. *Comparison of Statistical Experiments*. Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991. ISBN: 978-0-521-25030-6. DOI: [10.1017/CB09780511666353](https://doi.org/10.1017/CB09780511666353).
- [2] D. Petz. "Sufficient subalgebras and the relative entropy of states of a von Neumann algebra". In: *Communications in Mathematical Physics* 105.1 (Mar. 1, 1986), pp. 123–131. ISSN: 1432-0916. DOI: [10.1007/BF01212345](https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01212345).
- [3] D. Petz. "Sufficiency of channels over von Neumann algebras". In: *The Quarterly Journal of Mathematics* 39.1 (Mar. 1, 1988), pp. 97–108. ISSN: 0033-5606. DOI: [10.1093/qmath/39.1.97](https://doi.org/10.1093/qmath/39.1.97).
- [4] A. Jenčová and D. Petz. "Sufficiency in Quantum Statistical Inference". In: *Communications in Mathematical Physics* 263.1 (Apr. 1, 2006), pp. 259–276. ISSN: 1432-0916. DOI: [10.1007/s00220-005-1510-7](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00220-005-1510-7).
- [5] A. Jenčová and D. Petz. "Sufficiency in Quantum Statistical Inference: A Survey With Examples". In: *Infinite Dimensional Analysis, Quantum Probability and Related Topics* 09.03 (Sept. 2006), pp. 331–351. DOI: [10.1142/s0219025706002408](https://doi.org/10.1142/s0219025706002408).
- [6] M. Koashi and N. Imoto. "Operations that do not disturb partially known quantum states". In: *Physical Review A* 66.2 (Aug. 30, 2002). Publisher: American Physical Society, p. 022318. DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevA.66.022318](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevA.66.022318).
- [7] Y. Kuramochi. "Accessible Information Without Disturbing Partially Known Quantum States on a von Neumann Algebra". In: *International Journal of Theoretical Physics* 57.8 (Apr. 2018), pp. 2249–2266. DOI: [10.1007/s10773-018-3749-8](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10773-018-3749-8).
- [8] G. H. Hardy et al. *Inequalities*. Cambridge university press, 1952.

- [9] D. Blackwell. “Equivalent Comparisons of Experiments”. In: *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics* 24.2 (June 1953). Publisher: Institute of Mathematical Statistics, pp. 265–272. ISSN: 0003-4851, 2168-8990. DOI: [10.1214/aoms/1177729032](https://doi.org/10.1214/aoms/1177729032).
- [10] E. Ruch and A. Mead. “The principle of increasing mixing character and some of its consequences”. In: *Theoretica chimica acta* 41.2 (June 1, 1976), pp. 95–117. ISSN: 1432-2234. DOI: [10.1007/BF01178071](https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01178071).
- [11] E. Ruch, R. Schraner, and T. H. Seligman. “The mixing distance”. In: *The Journal of Chemical Physics* 69.1 (July 1978). Publisher: American Institute of Physics, pp. 386–392. ISSN: 0021-9606. DOI: [10.1063/1.436364](https://doi.org/10.1063/1.436364).
- [12] A. W. Marshall, I. Olkin, and B. C. Arnold. *Inequalities: Theory of Majorization and Its Applications*. Springer Series in Statistics. New York, NY: Springer New York, 2011. ISBN: 978-0-387-40087-7 978-0-387-68276-1. DOI: [10.1007/978-0-387-68276-1](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-387-68276-1).
- [13] M. Horodecki and J. Oppenheim. “Fundamental limitations for quantum and nanoscale thermodynamics”. In: *Nature Communications* 4.1 (June 26, 2013). Number: 1 Publisher: Nature Publishing Group, p. 2059. ISSN: 2041-1723. DOI: [10.1038/ncomms3059](https://doi.org/10.1038/ncomms3059).
- [14] M. Horodecki and J. Oppenheim. “(quantumness in the context of) resource theories”. In: *International Journal of Modern Physics B* 27.1 (Jan. 30, 2013). Publisher: World Scientific Publishing Co., p. 1345019. ISSN: 0217-9792. DOI: [10.1142/S0217979213450197](https://doi.org/10.1142/S0217979213450197).
- [15] J. M. Renes. “Relative submajorization and its use in quantum resource theories”. In: *Journal of Mathematical Physics* 57.12 (Dec. 2016). Publisher: American Institute of Physics, p. 122202. ISSN: 0022-2488. DOI: [10.1063/1.4972295](https://doi.org/10.1063/1.4972295).
- [16] G. Gour et al. “Quantum majorization and a complete set of entropic conditions for quantum thermodynamics”. In: *Nature Communications* 9.1 (Dec. 17, 2018). Number: 1 Publisher: Nature Publishing Group, p. 5352. ISSN: 2041-1723. DOI: [10.1038/s41467-018-06261-7](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-018-06261-7).
- [17] X. Wang and M. M. Wilde. “Resource theory of asymmetric distinguishability”. In: *Physical Review Research* 1.3 (Dec. 11, 2019). Publisher: American Physical Society, p. 033170. DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevResearch.1.033170](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevResearch.1.033170).
- [18] F. Buscemi, D. Sutter, and M. Tomamichel. “An information-theoretic treatment of quantum dichotomies”. In: *Quantum* 3 (Dec. 9, 2019). Publisher: Verein zur Förderung des Open Access Publizierens in den Quantenwissenschaften, p. 209. DOI: [10.22331/q-2019-12-09-209](https://doi.org/10.22331/q-2019-12-09-209).
- [19] K. Matsumoto. “Reverse Test and Characterization of Quantum Relative Entropy”. In: arXiv:1010.1030 (Oct. 5, 2010). DOI: [10.48550/arXiv.1010.1030](https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.1010.1030). arXiv: [1010.1030\[quant-ph\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/1010.1030).
- [20] M. U. Farooq et al. *Asymptotic and catalytic matrix majorization*. Jan. 18, 2023. DOI: [10.48550/arXiv.2301.07353](https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2301.07353). arXiv: [2301.07353\[quant-ph, stat\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/2301.07353).
- [21] P. Lipka-Bartosik et al. “Quantum dichotomies and coherent thermodynamics beyond first-order asymptotics”. In: arXiv:2303.05524 (Mar. 9, 2023). DOI: [10.48550/arXiv.2303.05524](https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2303.05524). arXiv: [2303.05524\[math-ph, physics:quant-ph\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/2303.05524).
- [22] S. Kullback and R. A. Leibler. “On information and sufficiency”. In: *The annals of mathematical statistics* 22.1 (1951), pp. 79–86. DOI: [10.1214/aoms/1177729694](https://doi.org/10.1214/aoms/1177729694).

- [23] F. Hiai. *Quantum f -Divergences in von Neumann Algebras*. Springer Singapore, 2021. DOI: [10.1007/978-981-33-4199-9](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-33-4199-9).
- [24] D. Jonathan and M. B. Plenio. “Entanglement-Assisted Local Manipulation of Pure Quantum States”. In: *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 83.17 (Oct. 1999), pp. 3566–3569. ISSN: 0031-9007, 1079-7114. DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevLett.83.3566](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.83.3566).
- [25] F. Brandão et al. “The second laws of quantum thermodynamics”. In: *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 112.11 (Mar. 17, 2015). Publisher: Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, pp. 3275–3279. DOI: [10.1073/pnas.1411728112](https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1411728112).
- [26] S. Rethinasamy and M. M. Wilde. “Relative entropy and catalytic relative majorization”. In: *Phys. Rev. Research* 2.3 (Sept. 2020), p. 033455. ISSN: 2643-1564. DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevResearch.2.033455](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevResearch.2.033455).
- [27] T. Fritz. “Resource convertibility and ordered commutative monoids”. In: *Mathematical Structures in Computer Science* 27.6 (Sept. 2017). Publisher: Cambridge University Press, pp. 850–938. ISSN: 0960-1295, 1469-8072. DOI: [10.1017/S0960129515000444](https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960129515000444).
- [28] M. Tomamichel. *Quantum Information Processing with Finite Resources*. Springer International Publishing, 2016. DOI: [10.1007/978-3-319-21891-5](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-21891-5).
- [29] E. Chitambar and G. Gour. “Quantum resource theories”. In: *Rev. Mod. Phys.* 91.2 (Apr. 2019). Publisher: American Physical Society, p. 025001. DOI: [10.1103/RevModPhys.91.025001](https://doi.org/10.1103/RevModPhys.91.025001).
- [30] D. Janzing et al. “Thermodynamic Cost of Reliability and Low Temperatures: Tightening Landauer’s Principle and the Second Law”. In: *Int. J. Th. Phys.* 39 (2000), p. 2717. DOI: [10.1023/A:1026422630734](https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1026422630734).
- [31] F. G. S. L. Brandão et al. “Resource Theory of Quantum States Out of Thermal Equilibrium”. In: *Physical Review Letters* 111.25 (Dec. 18, 2013). Publisher: American Physical Society, p. 250404. DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevLett.111.250404](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.111.250404).
- [32] N. Yunger Halpern and J. M. Renes. “Beyond heat baths: Generalized resource theories for small-scale thermodynamics”. In: *Physical Review E* 93.2 (Feb. 18, 2016). Publisher: American Physical Society, p. 022126. DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevE.93.022126](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevE.93.022126).
- [33] P. Faist, J. Oppenheim, and R. Renner. “Gibbs-Preserving maps outperform thermal operations in the quantum regime”. In: *New J. Phys.* 17 (2015), p. 043003. DOI: [10.1088/1367-2630/17/4/043003](https://doi.org/10.1088/1367-2630/17/4/043003).
- [34] P. Hayden et al. “Structure of States Which Satisfy Strong Subadditivity of Quantum Entropy with Equality”. In: *Communications in Mathematical Physics* 246.2 (Apr. 2004), pp. 359–374. DOI: [10.1007/s00220-004-1049-z](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00220-004-1049-z).
- [35] A. S. Holevo, M. E. Shirokov, and R. F. Werner. *Separability and Entanglement-Breaking in Infinite Dimensions*. arXiv:quant-ph/0504204. Apr. 2005. DOI: [10.48550/arXiv.quant-ph/0504204](https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.quant-ph/0504204).
- [36] Y. Kuramochi. “Minimal sufficient statistical experiments on von Neumann algebras”. In: *Journal of Mathematical Physics* 58.6 (June 2017), p. 062203. DOI: [10.1063/1.4986247](https://doi.org/10.1063/1.4986247).
- [37] M. Berta, O. Fawzi, and M. Tomamichel. “On variational expressions for quantum relative entropies”. In: *Letters in Mathematical Physics* 107.12 (Dec. 1, 2017), pp. 2239–2265. ISSN: 1573-0530. DOI: [10.1007/s11005-017-0990-7](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11005-017-0990-7).

- [38] V. P. Belavkin and P. Staszewski. “ C^* -algebraic generalization of relative entropy and entropy”. In: *Annales de l’institut Henri Poincaré. Section A, Physique Théorique* 37.1 (1982), pp. 51–58. ISSN: 2400-4863.
- [39] K. M. R. Audenaert and N. Datta. “ α -z-Rényi relative entropies”. In: *Journal of Mathematical Physics* 56.2 (Feb. 18, 2015), p. 022202. ISSN: 0022-2488. DOI: [10.1063/1.4906367](https://doi.org/10.1063/1.4906367).
- [40] M. Nussbaum and A. Szkoła. “The Chernoff lower bound for symmetric quantum hypothesis testing”. In: *The Annals of Statistics* 37.2 (2009), pp. 1040–1057. DOI: [10.1214/08-AOS593](https://doi.org/10.1214/08-AOS593).
- [41] H. Araki. “On an inequality of Lieb and Thirring”. In: *Letters in Mathematical Physics* 19.2 (Feb. 1, 1990), pp. 167–170. ISSN: 1573-0530. DOI: [10.1007/BF01045887](https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01045887).
- [42] E. H. Lieb and W. E. Thirring. “Inequalities for the Moments of the Eigenvalues of the Schrödinger Hamiltonian and Their Relation to Sobolev Inequalities”. In: *The Stability of Matter: From Atoms to Stars: Selecta of Elliott H. Lieb*. Ed. by E. H. Lieb and W. Thirring. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer, 2005, pp. 205–239. ISBN: 978-3-540-27056-0. DOI: [10.1007/3-540-27056-6_16](https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-27056-6_16).
- [43] F. Hiai. “Equality cases in matrix norm inequalities of golden-thompson type”. In: *Linear and Multilinear Algebra* 36.4 (Apr. 1, 1994). Publisher: Taylor & Francis _eprint: <https://doi.org/10.1080/03081089408818297>, pp. 239–249. ISSN: 0308-1087. DOI: [10.1080/03081089408818297](https://doi.org/10.1080/03081089408818297).
- [44] N. Datta and F. Leditzky. “A limit of the quantum Rényi divergence”. In: *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical* 47.4 (Jan. 2014). Publisher: IOP Publishing, p. 045304. ISSN: 1751-8121. DOI: [10.1088/1751-8113/47/4/045304](https://doi.org/10.1088/1751-8113/47/4/045304).
- [45] D. Sutter. *Approximate Quantum Markov Chains*. Vol. 28. SpringerBriefs in Mathematical Physics. Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2018. ISBN: 978-3-319-78731-2 978-3-319-78732-9. DOI: [10.1007/978-3-319-78732-9](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-78732-9).
- [46] T. Tao. *An introduction to measure theory*. Vol. 126. American Mathematical Soc., 2011.
- [47] M. Merkle. “Completely Monotone Functions: A Digest”. In: *Analytic Number Theory, Approximation Theory, and Special Functions: In Honor of Hari M. Srivastava*. Ed. by G. V. Milovanović and M. T. Rassias. New York, NY: Springer, 2014, pp. 347–364. ISBN: 978-1-4939-0258-3. DOI: [10.1007/978-1-4939-0258-3_12](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4939-0258-3_12).
- [48] A. M. Fink. “Kolmogorov-Landau inequalities for monotone functions”. In: *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications* 90.1 (Nov. 1, 1982), pp. 251–258. ISSN: 0022-247X. DOI: [10.1016/0022-247X\(82\)90057-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-247X(82)90057-9).
- [49] D. S. Mitrinović, J. E. Pečarić, and A. M. Fink. “Some Inequalities for Monotone Functions”. In: *Classical and New Inequalities in Analysis*. Ed. by D. S. Mitrinović, J. E. Pečarić, and A. M. Fink. Mathematics and Its Applications (). Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands, 1993, pp. 365–378. ISBN: 978-94-017-1043-5. DOI: [10.1007/978-94-017-1043-5_13](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-017-1043-5_13).
- [50] P. Chansangiam. “A Survey on Operator Monotonicity, Operator Convexity, and Operator Means”. In: *International Journal of Analysis* 2015 (Nov. 2015). Ed. by J. Salomon. Publisher: Hindawi Publishing Corporation, p. 649839. ISSN: 2314-498X. DOI: [10.1155/2015/649839](https://doi.org/10.1155/2015/649839).

- [51] A. Uhlmann. “Ordnungsstrukturen im Raume der gemischten Zustände und die H-Theoreme von Felderhof - van Kampen”. In: *Wiss. Z. Karl-Marx-Univ. Leipzig, Math.-Nat. R.* 27 (1978), pp. 213–228.
- [52] R. V. Kadison. “Isometries of Operator Algebras”. In: *Annals of Mathematics* 54.2 (1951), pp. 325–338. issn: 0003486X.